

**State of New Mexico**  
**LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE**

**REPRESENTATIVES**

Rick Miera, Chair  
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales  
Jimmie C. Hall  
Mimi Stewart  
Thomas E. Swisstack  
W. C. "Dub" Williams

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501  
PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338  
<http://lesc.nmlegis.gov>



**SENATORS**

Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair  
Vernon D. Asbill  
Mary Jane M. Garcia  
Gay G. Kernan

**ADVISORY**

Andrew J. Barreras  
Ray Begaye  
Nathan P. Cote  
Nora Espinoza  
Mary Helen Garcia  
Thomas A. Garcia  
Dianne Miller Hamilton  
John A. Heaton  
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton  
Jim R. Trujillo  
Teresa A. Zanetti

**ADVISORY**

Mark Boitano  
Carlos R. Cisneros  
Dianna J. Duran  
Lynda M. Lovejoy  
Howie C. Morales  
John Pinto  
William E. Sharer

Frances R. Maestas, Director

December 18, 2008

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Legislative Education Study Committee

**FR:** Kathleen Forrer *K.F.*

**RE: STAFF REPORT: REVIEW OF PROPOSED PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING  
FORMULA: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CHARTER  
SCHOOLS SURVEY**

After several vetoed appropriations to fund a study of the Public School Funding Formula, in 2005, the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) endorsed legislation that was enacted to create a Funding Formula Study Task Force. In 2006 the Legislature extended the term of the task force through December 2007 and appropriated dollars for an independent study of the funding formula.

In order to carry out its charge, in August 2006, the task force selected American Institutes for Research (AIR), headquartered in Palo Alto, California, to conduct an independent study of the funding formula. Based on the tasks identified in the Request for Proposals (RFP) and other discussions, the contractor provided several recommendations and an estimate of the cost of implementing those recommendations to the task force. On January 7, 2008, the task force adopted a discussion draft of a bill that incorporated those recommendations. The LESC endorsed the task force recommendations on January 14, 2008.

House Bill 241 (HB 241), *Public School Funding Formula Changes*, proposed that the state move from a formula based on multiple program factors to a formula with fewer factors that are based on indicators of student need, including the percentage of students who are eligible for free

and reduced lunch and the percentage of students classified as English language learners. Although the bill was amended several times during the session, it did not pass.

For the 2008 interim, all 89 school districts and 14 charter schools were invited to work with the LESC to examine the potential impact on school district programs and student achievement of the public school funding formula proposed in HB 241. In order to facilitate this effort, the districts were grouped according to student membership and scheduled to attend one of six LESC interim meetings held in Albuquerque, Chama, Deming, Kirtland/Farmington, Roswell, and Santa Fe. However, in an effort to secure broad representation, the charter schools were chosen in conjunction with the New Mexico Coalition for Charter Schools on the basis of their geographic location and grade-level configuration (elementary, mid, and high school).

Prior to each meeting, the districts and charter schools scheduled to present were sent a memorandum that included a set of questions jointly developed by LESC staff and the Secretary of Public Education. The discussions between the LESC and the districts and charter schools centered around those questions. In addition, the school districts and charter schools were asked to provide written responses to the questions. This report summarizes the written responses.

## **SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

In total, 87 of New Mexico's 89 public school districts participated in the discussions with the LESC regarding the proposed public school funding formula, and 85 districts provided written responses to the questions posed in the memorandum. (See Attachment 1.) In a manner similar to the way in which the district presentations were conducted, the written responses are summarized according to the following three size groupings based on 2007-2008 funded membership: districts with a membership of 5,000 or greater; districts with a membership between 1,000 and 5,000; and districts with a membership less than 1,000.<sup>1</sup>

### **Programs and Services:**

1. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula affect your district's program cost?

When in the summer and fall of 2007 the consultants from AIR estimated the cost of implementing the proposed funding formula and developed the district and charter school calculators, they compared the program cost generated by the new funding formula to the

---

<sup>1</sup> The following school districts have a 2007-2008 funded membership greater than 5,000: Alamogordo, Albuquerque, Carlsbad, Central Consolidated, Clovis, Deming, Farmington, Gadsden, Gallup-McKinley, Hobbs, Las Cruces, Los Lunas, Rio Rancho, Roswell, and Santa Fe.

The following school districts have a 2007-2008 funded membership between 1,000 and 5,000: Artesia, Aztec, Belen, Bernalillo, Bloomfield, Cobre Consolidated, Dexter, Española, Estancia, Grants-Cibola, Hatch Valley, Las Vegas City, Los Alamos, Lovington, Moriarty, Pojoaque, Portales, Raton, Ruidoso, Silver Consolidated, Socorro, Taos, Truth or Consequences, Tucumcari, Tularosa, West Las Vegas, and Zuni.

The following school districts have a 2007-2008 funded membership less than 1,000: Animas, Capitan, Carrizozo, Chama Valley, Cimarron, Clayton, Cloudcroft, Corona, Cuba, Des Moines, Dora, Dulce, Elida, Eunice, Floyd, Fort Sumner, Grady, Hagerman, Hondo Valley, House, Jal, Jemez Mountain, Jemez Valley, Lake Arthur, Logan, Lordsburg, Loving, Magdalena, Maxwell, Melrose, Mesa Vista, Mora, Mosquero, Mountainair, Pecos, Peñasco, Quemado, Questa, Reserve, Roy, San Jon, Santa Rosa, Springer, Tatum, Texico, Vaughn, and Wagon Mound.

most recent data available at the time—the 2007-2008 operating budget program cost generated by the current funding formula plus the budgeted emergency supplemental allocations. (The supplemental emergency allocations were included because, despite the name, small school districts in particular have been relying upon the additional emergency supplemental funds to cover recurring operational expenditures.) However, once the Public Education Department (PED) determines the final unit value for a school year, the result may be an increase or decrease in program cost, and the department adjusts the emergency supplemental distributions accordingly. Therefore, the final funded (actual) program cost and the emergency supplemental distributions for school year 2007-2008 differ from the numbers used for comparison in the district and charter school calculators.

Attachment 2 provides an updated comparison for school districts of the projected program cost generated by the proposed funding formula to the actual program cost generated under the current public school funding formula and the actual supplemental emergency distributions for school year 2007-2008. Of the 89 school districts, three—Los Alamos, Pecos, and Mosquero—indicated loss under the proposed funding formula.

2. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula impact the educational programs and student services provided by your district?

a) Educational Programs:

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**

The districts in this group expressed a broad range of needs but the most frequently mentioned the need for additional teachers to reduce class size; high quality, targeted professional development; an extended school day or extended school year; and additional intervention specialists and instructional coaches, particularly in the areas of math and reading. Most of the districts stressed the importance of implementing one or more aspects of the state's High School Redesign initiative, and three districts specifically mentioned continuous improvement of student achievement and organizational quality as a major objective. Other needs identified by various districts included additional elementary music and art teachers; technology coordinators; certified elementary librarians; staff to enhance Response to Intervention (RtI); improved services for both handicapped and gifted students; Indian education programs; additional bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) staff; additional career and technical education and dual credit opportunities for students; greater access to online courses and Advanced Placement (AP) courses; and expansion of K-3 Plus.

Several districts expressed a need to use some of the additional funding generated by the proposed funding formula to enhance staff salaries and to reinstate programs that they had previously been forced to cut, such as high school electives, after-school programs, and drug intervention programs. A number of districts also cited a need to develop and support strong instructional leadership at the school and district level.

A number of districts did not distinguish between educational programs and student services, choosing to answer both parts of Question 2 together.

**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

Many of the midsize districts stated that they would add or extend instructional and professional development days. Most districts also expressed the desire to provide more support for teachers and administrative staff, including expanded mentoring programs; instructional coaches, particularly in the areas of technology, math, and reading; and targeted professional development.

Programmatic changes envisioned by the districts included class-size reduction; expansion of Reading First strategies (even after the grants run out); restoration or expansion of elementary and middle school art, music, and physical education programs; additional before- and after-school programs; expanded programs and opportunities for gifted and talented students; enhanced and more fully staffed bilingual and ESL programs; enhanced career and technical education programs, including dual credit; and implementation of and continuing support for RtI. In addition, every district responding to the survey cited a need to implement and/or expand extended day, extended year, and other types of intervention programs for at-risk students, and many indicated. One district suggested expansion of the laptop initiative.

Districts also expressed the need for additional staff, including teachers with Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) or bilingual endorsement; resource teachers; instructional/intervention specialists; nurses, counselors, and social workers; technology and data entry staff; truancy officers; and security officers.

While a number of districts indicated that the additional funding they might receive under the proposed funding formula would be too little to implement program or staff increases, one district—Los Alamos—explained that implementation of the proposed formula would mean a significant loss to the district (approximately \$2.0 million), resulting in program and staff cuts. The district requested that the Legislature consider including a hold harmless provision in any legislation to institute the proposed funding formula.

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

Almost all of the districts that would receive enough new funding to hire additional staff stated that they would hire math and reading interventionists. Several districts stated that they would use some of the additional funding to support after-school and summer programs that are currently being funded by grants due to expire. Other programs that districts expressed a desire to initiate or expand were elementary fine arts, gifted, bilingual, RtI, and vocational programs.

A number of districts, particularly those with memberships of 150 or fewer, expressed concern that, as their enrollments continue to decline, they will once again be forced to depend upon emergency supplemental distributions, albeit to a lesser degree. Other districts stated that they were pleased that they would no longer have to depend upon emergency supplemental funding.

Districts also expressed support for the Regional Education Cooperatives, citing their assistance in providing cost effective special education, professional development, and other services.

b) Student Services:

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**

A number of districts in this group indicated similar needs with regard to both educational programs and student services. A few provided a single response, making no distinction at all between educational programs and student services.

With regard to staff positions, districts cited needs for more nurses, academic and behavioral counselors, social workers, certified elementary school librarians, technology coordinators, truancy officers, custodians and maintenance workers, and ancillary service providers and other special education personnel.

Among the programs districts hoped to support or expand were health and wellness programs; middle school athletics; parental and community involvement activities; career and technical education; and after school and tutoring programs. Other initiatives cited were enhanced activities for handicapped children, including the Special Olympics, Special Arts, and recreational therapy; implementation of the teaming concept in grades 7 through 9; and the development of alternative settings for regular education students who might otherwise be subject to suspension or expulsion.

**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

For many districts in this group, as in the other two groups, the line between educational programs and student services was not clear cut. The most frequently cited need was for additional mental health and guidance counselors, nurses, and social workers. Districts also cited other staff needs, including math and reading intervention specialists, data analyst, custodians, maintenance workers, technical support personnel, truancy officers, an attendance clerk, a resource officer, tutors, and certified librarians.

Districts in this group also wanted to provide additional extracurricular and activities for both middle and high school students, extend school library hours, expand physical education programs, enhance family involvement activities, provide additional support for special education and for RtI, initiate credit recovery programs, expand access to distance education, purchase additional hardware and software for student use, and fund transportation for after-school and extended year programs. One district intended to use some of its additional funding for incentives to increase student attendance.

Several districts indicated that they would not receive sufficient funds to increase student services. Los Alamos again noted that a projected loss of funds would require the district to reduce services.

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

All but a few districts expressed the need for additional academic, career, and mental health counselors, social workers, and nurses. Many districts also indicated a need for certified librarians, technology support, after-school tutoring, and parent involvement training. Several districts stated that they would use additional funds to support Native American and other community liaisons. Two districts stated that they would use some of the additional dollars to support food services, including universal free breakfast and lunch programs.

A number of districts said that they do not distinguish between educational programs and student services because both are necessary in order for students to achieve academic success.

3. Will your district use the additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to reduce class size? If so, what grades, and how many classrooms would be affected?

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:****Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:****Membership Less Than 1,000:**

Of the 45 districts answering this question:

- three said they would eliminate combined grade-level classes;
- four said they would hire interventionists;
- five said they would reduce class sizes at the elementary level;
- two said they would reduce class sizes at the middle school level;
- six said they would reduce class sizes at the elementary and the high school levels;
- three said they would reduce class sizes at the middle and high school levels;
- three said they would reduce class sizes at the elementary, middle, and high school levels;
- two indicated that they would not receive enough money to reduce class size; and
- 17 stated that they had no need to reduce class size.

4. What other changes might your district consider as a result of additional funding?

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:****Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:****Membership Less Than 1,000:**

5. How will your district ensure that it provides all of the following educational programs and services as required in the funding formula bill, as amended, during the session?

- bilingual and multicultural education, including culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials;
- health and wellness, including physical education, athletics, nutrition, and health education;
- career-technical education;
- visual and performing arts and music;
- gifted education, advanced placement, and honors programs;
- special education; and
- distance education.

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**

**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your district would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

Statewide, school districts indicated a need for a total of approximately 2,979 additional full-time equivalent staff in both teaching and other positions (see Attachment 3). However, at least eight school districts indicated either that any increase in program cost generated by the proposed funding formula would be insufficient to allow them to increase staff or that they have no need to increase staff: Cobre, Española, Lake Arthur, Maxwell, Pecos, Roy, Springer, and Vaughn. One school district, Los Alamos, indicated that the decrease in program cost would be so significant, barring a hold harmless provision, that the district would be required to reduce staff by approximately 57 full-time equivalent positions.

Note: No responses were received from Las Vegas City, Mosquero, Pojoaque, and Taos.

**Accountability:**

The legislation introduced during the 2008 session to change the public school funding formula utilizes the Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) as the means of ensuring accountability with regard to districts providing a sufficient educational program for all students that includes not only the basic required academic programs, such as reading, writing, and math, but also programs such as bilingual-multicultural education, physical education, arts and music, and gifted programs. In short, PED is required to disapprove any budget for a district or charter school that cannot show in its EPSS that it is offering all required programs.

7. Do you believe that the EPSS is the appropriate mechanism to tie together budget approval and program delivery? If not, what means would you suggest be used as an alternative to ensure accountability?

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**

**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

**Staff Salaries:**

The proposed funding formula would replace the current Training and Experience (T&E) Index with the Index of Staff Qualifications (ISQ). Although both indexes are designed to distribute additional funding to districts and charter schools based on the composition of their instructional staff, they are not identical:

- The T&E calculation is based on years of service and academic degrees for all instructional staff but does not reflect the three-tiered licensure system for teachers.
  - The ISQ calculation recognizes not only experience and academic degrees but also licensure levels. It was calibrated on the average teacher salaries for each of the three levels and distributes additional dollars based on the proportion of teachers in each of those levels. In addition, there is a second calculation for those instructional staff, such as counselors, who are not included in the three-tiered system. Because the base per-student cost upon which the proposed formula is based already reflects the average salary by personnel category in the average district, the ISQ is applied only to salary costs in a district or charter school that are beyond the average.
8. If you have calculated your district's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (see attachment), how would this factor impact funding for your district?

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**

**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

**Special Education:**

9. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as in need of special education, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent? (Do not include gifted students.)

See Attachment 4.

10. How will the proposed funding formula's use of a fixed special education identification rate of 16 percent impact special education funding for your district?

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**



**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

**Gifted Education:**

11. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as gifted, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent?

See Attachment 4.

12. Even though the bill as amended during the session does not require districts to consider students that have been identified as gifted to be in need of special education, it does require that these students be served. How will your district specifically address the needs of students identified as gifted?

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**

**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

**Revenue Sources for Implementation:**

13. What revenue sources for the additional dollars needed to reach sufficiency would your district support?

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**

**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

**Potential Problems:**

14. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise from the implementation of the proposed funding formula?

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**

**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

15. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise if the proposed funding formula is not implemented?

**Membership of 5,000 or Greater:**

**Membership from 1,000 to 4,999:**

**Membership Less Than 1,000:**

16. Please feel free to identify any other issues that have not been addressed in these questions that you feel the committee should be aware of.

See Attachment 5.

## CHARTER SCHOOLS

Nine of the 14 charter schools invited to participate in a discussion with the LESC regarding the proposed funding formula came to the meeting in Albuquerque, and of the nine schools participating, only Taos Charter School provided written responses (see Attachment 1).<sup>2</sup> Below are the written responses from Taos Charter School (in *italics*) to the memorandum sent to the 14 charter schools invited to participate in discussions with the LESC regarding the proposed public school funding formula. Where available, data pertaining to other charter schools also are included.

It is important to note that the proposed public school funding formula for school districts and the proposed public school funding formula for charter schools, although fundamentally the same, differ in two regards: (1) the base per-student cost is higher for charter schools (\$6,907) than for school districts (\$5,106); and (2) the special education formula adjustment for school districts is census-based (16 percent), while the adjustment for charter schools is based on the actual percentage of students receiving special education services.

1. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula affect your charter school's program cost?

---

<sup>2</sup> The following charter school were invited to participate: Aldo Leopold High School (Silver City); Creative Education Preparatory Institute 1 (Albuquerque); Deming Cesar Chavez Charter High School (Deming); Digital Arts and Technology Academy (Albuquerque); El Camino Real Charter School (Albuquerque); Middle College High School (Gallup); Mosaic Academy Charter School (Aztec); Nuestros Valores Charter High School (Albuquerque); Rio Gallinas School (West Las Vegas); Sidney Gutierrez Middle School (Roswell); Southwest Secondary Learning Center (Albuquerque); Taos Charter School (Taos); Turquoise Trail Charter School (Santa Fe); and Walatowa High Charter School (Jemez Pueblo).

The following nine charter schools participated in the discussion: Creative Education Preparatory Institute 1; Deming Cesar Chavez Charter High School; Digital Arts and Technology Academy; Mosaic Academy Charter School; Nuestros Valores Charter High School; Southwest Secondary Learning Center; Taos Charter School; Turquoise Trail Charter School; and Walatowa High Charter School.

Attachment 6 provides an updated comparison for charter schools of the projected program cost generated by the proposed funding formula to the actual program cost generated under the current public school funding formula and the actual supplemental emergency distributions for school year 2007-2008. Of the 58 charter schools for whom AIR was able to calculate a program cost using the proposed formula, 22 indicated a loss.<sup>3</sup>

**Issue:** At the August 2008 LESC meeting, most of the charter schools participating in the funding formula discussion stated that the Student Teacher Accountability Reporting System (STARS) data used in the proposed formula calculation did not accurately reflect the needs of their schools. In addition, several charter schools explained that they did not report the number of students eligible for free and reduced-fee lunches either because they did not participate in the program or because the district provided the meals and included the charter school's students in the district's count. Because the proposed funding formula is dependent upon accurate free and reduced-fee data as one of its major cost adjustments, the lack of accurate data results in lower overall adjustment factors for a number of charter schools (and possibly for some school districts, as well).

2. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula impact the educational programs and student services provided by your charter school?
  - (a) Educational Programs: *Implementation of the new funding formula will allow Taos Charter School to increase teaching staff and reduce class size.*
  - (b) Student Services: *Implementation of the new funding formula will afford Taos Charter School the operating budget necessary to hire a librarian, teacher's assistant and counselor, all of which are important and necessary student services.*
3. Will your charter school use any additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to reduce class size? If so, what grades, and how many classrooms would be affected?
 

*Taos Charter School would use any additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to hire additional teaching staff in an effort to reduce class size in grades 1 and 2.*
4. What other changes might your charter school consider as a result of any additional funding?

---

<sup>3</sup> The following 22 charter schools had a calculated 2007-2008 program cost using the proposed funding formula that was lower than the actual 2007-2008 program cost using the current formula: Albuquerque Institute of Math & Science/AIMS-UNM (Albuquerque); Amy Biehl Charter High (Albuquerque); Cesar Chavez Community School (Albuquerque); Christine Duncan Community (Albuquerque); La Luz del Monte Learning Center (Albuquerque); La Promesa Early Learning Center (Albuquerque); Montessori Elementary School (Albuquerque); Montessori of the Rio Grande (Albuquerque); Mountain Mahogany Community School (Albuquerque); Native American Community Academy (Albuquerque); North Albuquerque Co-op Community (Albuquerque); Southwest Secondary Learning Center (Albuquerque); Mosaic Academy Charter (Aztec); Village Academy (Bernalillo); Deming Cesar Chavez Charter High (Deming); Cariños de los Niños (Española); Middle College High School (Gallup); Lindrith Area Heritage Charter School (Jemez Mountain); Academy for Technology and the Classics (Santa Fe); Charter School 37 (Santa Fe); Aldo Leopold Charter School (Silver City); and Rio Gallinas School (West Las Vegas).

*Other changes Taos Charter would consider, in addition to items identified in our response to question 2(b), are hiring a math tutor to assist in bringing incoming students up to the same level of proficiency as students currently within the institution and hiring maintenance personnel to address the many school maintenance issues. If budget permitted, we would also like to offer more after-school activities for students, such as music, chess club and sports activities.*

5. How will your charter school ensure that it provides all of the following educational programs and services as required in the funding formula bill, as amended, during the session?

- bilingual and multicultural education, including culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials;
- health and wellness, including physical education, athletics, nutrition, and health education;
- career-technical education;
- visual and performing arts and music;
- gifted education, advanced placement, and honors programs;
- special education; and
- distance education.

*Taos Charter School would ensure that all educational programs and services are implemented, as provided in the new funding formula bill, through its internal budgeting process. It will still be necessary, however, for the Public Education Department to continue its regulatory oversight and review as it does with other legislative mandates to ensure compliance.*

6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your charter school would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

The school indicates that it would add teachers, a librarian, an educational assistant, a counselor, and maintenance personnel (see answers to questions 2, 3, and 4 above).

**Accountability:**

7. Do you believe that the EPSS is the appropriate mechanism to tie together budget approval and program delivery? If not, what means would you suggest be used as an alternative to ensure accountability?

*Taos Charter School believes that the EPSS is the appropriate mechanism to tie together budget approval and program delivery.*

**Staff Salaries:**

8. If you have calculated your charter school's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (see attachment), how would this factor impact funding for your district?

*Taos Charter School has calculated its ISQ and it would result in a decrease in funding because its current T&E is 1.096, resulting in a decrease of approximately 9%.*

**Special Education:**

9. Currently, how many students in your charter school have been identified as in need of special education, and what percentage of your charter school's enrollment does this number represent? (Do not include gifted students.)

See Attachment 7.

10. How will the proposed funding formula's use of your charter school's actual special education identification rate impact special education funding for your school?

*Taos Charter School does not fully understand the implications of the proposed funding formula's use of its actual special education identification rate in determining funding. It is our hope that it would result in an increase in funding and that the new formula would take into consideration current year special education needs when determining our funding allocations.*

**Gifted Education:**

11. Currently, how many students in your charter school have been identified as gifted, and what percentage of your charter school's enrollment does this number represent?

See Attachment 7.

12. Even though the bill as amended during the session does not require charter schools to consider students that have been identified as gifted to be in need of special education, it does require that these students be served. How will your charter school specifically address the needs of students identified as gifted?

*Taos Charter School believes that this is an institutional priority and already has a 1.00 FTE Special Education Teacher to address its gifted students' needs in our operating budget.*

**Revenue Sources for Implementation:**

13. What revenue sources for the additional dollars needed to reach sufficiency would your charter school support?

*Taos Charter School would support any local or state tax increase to enhance funding and to achieve sufficiency.*

**Potential Problems:**

14. What problems, if any, does your charter school anticipate will arise from the implementation of the proposed funding formula?

*Taos Charter School under the proposed funding formula would enjoy an increase in funding but many other charters or districts are likely to see a decrease in funding. The future*

*reduction in funding for charters or districts will result in an increase for emergency supplemental requests and hold harmless funding formula options to preserve adequate funding levels necessary to provide a quality education for the students we serve.*

15. What problems, if any, does your charter school anticipate will arise if the proposed funding formula is not implemented?

*If the proposed new funding formula is not implemented, we will continue to operate and receive funding in the same manner we are used to. The current formula, although not perfect, provides a basis for the distribution of state funding for educational institutions based on parameters we are already familiar with.*

16. Please feel free to identify any other issues that have not been addressed in these questions that you feel the committee should be aware of.

*The issue of cash flow is becoming a greater concern to charter schools, new and old, as changes regarding the reimbursement of grants have shifted greater cash flow reliance to charter school SEG operating funds.*

**SCHOOL DISTRICT AND CHARTER SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE LESC  
REGARDING THE PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA  
2008 INTERIM**

	DISTRICT	PRESENTED TO COMMITTEE	PROVIDED WRITTEN RESPONSES	CHARTER SCHOOL	INVITED TO PRESENT	PRESENTED TO COMMITTEE	PROVIDED WRITTEN RESPONSES	
1	ALAMOGORDO	✓	✓	ALBUQUERQUE				1
2	ALBUQUERQUE	✓	✓	ACADEMIA DE LENGUA Y CULTURA				2
3	ANIMAS	✓	✓	AIMS/UNM (High Tech High)				3
4	ARTESIA	✓	✓	ALB TALENT DEV SECONDARY (2007-2008)*				4
5	AZTEC	✓	✓	AMY BIEHL				5
6	BELEN	✓	✓	BATAAN MILITARY ACADEMY (2007-2008)*				6
7	BERNALILLO	✓	✓	CAREER ACADEMIC TECH ACADEMY (2007-2008)*				7
8	BLOOMFIELD	✓	✓	CESAR CHAVEZ COMM. SCHOOL				8
9	CAPITAN	✓	✓	CHRISTINE DUNCAN COMMUNITY				9
10	CARLSBAD	✓	✓	CORRALES INTERNATIONAL (2008-2009)				10
11	CARRIZOZO	✓	✓	CREATIVE ED. PREP INSTITUTE #1	✓	✓		11
12	CENTRAL CONS.	✓	✓	CREATIVE ED. PREP INSTITUTE #2				12
13	CHAMA VALLEY	✓	✓	DIGITAL ARTS & TECH ACADEMY	✓	✓		13
14	CIMARRON	✓	✓	EAST MOUNTAIN				14
15	CLAYTON	✓	✓	EL CAMINO REAL (Horizon Academy South)	✓			15
16	CLOUDCROFT	✓	✓	GORDON BERNALL (2008-2009)				16
17	CLOVIS	✓	✓	LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA				17
18	COBRE CONS.	✓	✓	LA LUZ DEL MONTE				18
19	CORONA	✓	✓	LA PROMESA EARLY LEADERSHIP				19
20	CUBA	✓	✓	LA RESOLANA LEADERSHIP				20
21	DEMING	✓	✓	LOS PUENTES				21
22	DES MOINES	✓	✓	MONTESSORI ELEMENTARY				22
23	DEXTER	✓	✓	MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE				23
24	DORA	✓	✓	MOUNTAIN MAHOGANY				24
25	DULCE	✓	✓	NATIVE AMERICAN COMM ACAD.				25
26	ELIDA	✓	✓	NORTH ALBUQUERQUE CO-OP COMM.				26
27	ESPAÑOLA	✓	✓	NUESTROS VALORES	✓	✓		27
28	ESTANCIA	✓	✓	PAPA				28
29	EUNICE	✓	✓	RALPH J. BUNCHE ACADEMY				29
30	FARMINGTON	✓	✓	ROBERT F. KENNEDY				30
31	FLOYD	✓	✓	SIA TECH				31
32	FT. SUMNER	✓	✓	SOUTH VALLEY				32
33	GADSDEN	✓	✓	SOUTHWEST PRIMARY				33
34	GALLUP-McKINLEY	✓	✓	SOUTHWEST SECONDARY	✓	✓		34
35	GRADY	✓	✓	THE LRNG COMM CTR				35
36	GRANTS-CIBOLA	✓	✓	TWENTY FIRST CENT.				36
37	HAGERMAN	✓	✓	YOUTH BUILD COMMUNITY				37
38	HATCH VALLEY	✓	✓	AZTEC				38
39	HOBBS	✓	✓	MOSAIC ACADEMY CHARTER	✓	✓		39
40	HONDO VALLEY	✓	✓	BERNALILLO				40
41	HOUSE	✓	✓	VILLAGE ACADEMY				41
42	JAL	✓	✓	CARLSBAD				42
43	JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	✓	✓	JEFFERSON MONT. ACAD.				43
44	JEMEZ VALLEY	✓	✓	CIMARRON				44
45	LAKE ARTHUR	✓	✓	MORENO VALLEY HIGH				45
46	LAS CRUCES	✓	✓	DEMING				46
47	LAS VEGAS CITY	✓	✓	DEMING CESAR CHAVEZ	✓	✓		47
48	LOGAN	✓	✓	ESPAÑOLA				48
49	LORDSBURG	✓	✓	CARIÑOS DE LOS NIÑOS				49
50	LOS ALAMOS	✓	✓	ESPAÑOLA MILITARY ACAD				50
51	LOS LUNAS	✓	✓	GALLUP				51
52	LOVING	✓	✓	MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH	✓			52
53	LOVINGTON	✓	✓	JEMEZ MOUNTAIN				53
54	MAGDALENA	✓	✓	LINDRITH AREA HERITAGE				54
55	MAXWELL	✓	✓	JEMEZ VALLEY				55
56	MELROSE	✓	✓	SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER				56
57	MESA VISTA	✓	✓	WALATOWA HIGH CHARTER	✓	✓		57
58	MORA	✓	✓	LAS CRUCES				58
59	MORIARTY	✓	✓	ALMA D'ARTE CHARTER				59
60	MOSQUERO	✓	✓	LA ACADEMIA DOLORES HUERTA				60
61	MOUNTAINAIR	✓	✓	LAS MONTAÑAS (2007-2008)*				61
62	PECOS		✓	QUESTA				62
63	PEÑASCO	✓	✓	RED RIVER VALLEY				63
64	POJOAQUE			ROOTS & WINGS				64

**SCHOOL DISTRICT AND CHARTER SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE LESC  
REGARDING THE PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA  
2008 INTERIM**

	DISTRICT	PRESENTED TO COMMITTEE	PROVIDED WRITTEN RESPONSES	CHARTER SCHOOL	INVITED TO PRESENT	PRESENTED TO COMMITTEE	PROVIDED WRITTEN RESPONSES	
65	PORTALES	✓	✓	ROSWELL				65
66	QUEMADO	✓	✓	SIDNEY GUTIERREZ	✓			66
67	QUESTA	✓	✓	SANTA FE				67
68	RATON	✓	✓	ACAD FOR TECH & CLASSICS				68
69	RESERVE	✓	✓	CHARTER SCHOOL #37				69
70	RIO RANCHO	✓	✓	MONTE DEL SOL				70
71	ROSWELL	✓	✓	TURQUOISE TRAIL	✓	✓		71
72	ROY	✓	✓	SILVER CITY CONS.				72
73	RUIDOSO	✓	✓	ALDO LEOPOLD	✓			73
74	SAN JON	✓	✓	SOCORRO				74
75	SANTA FE	✓	✓	COTTONWOOD CHARTER				75
76	SANTA ROSA	✓	✓	TAOS				76
77	SILVER CONS.	✓	✓	ANANSI CHARTER				77
78	SOCORRO CONS.	✓	✓	TAOS CHARTER	✓	✓	✓	78
79	SPRINGER	✓	✓	VISTA GRANDE (2007-2008)*				79
80	TAOS	✓		WEST LAS VEGAS				80
81	TATUM	✓	✓	RIO GALLINAS CHARTER SCHOOL	✓			81
82	TEXICO	✓	✓					82
83	TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	✓	✓	STATE CHARTERS				83
84	TUCUMCARI	✓	✓	COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL (Albuquerque/2008-2009)*				84
85	TULAROSA	✓	✓	HORIZON ACADEMY WEST (Albuquerque)				85
86	VAUGHN	✓	✓	MEDIA ARTS COLLABORATIVE (Albuquerque/2008-2009)*				86
87	WAGON MOUND	✓	✓	NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY (Albuquerque)				87
88	WEST LAS VEGAS	✓	✓					88
89	ZUNI	✓	✓					89
90	STATEWIDE	87	85	TOTAL NUMBER OF CHARTER SCHOOLS: 67	14	9	1	90

\*These charter schools were not included in the original analysis done by the American Institutes of Research (AIR).



PROPOSED PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO  
2007-2008 FINAL FUNDED PROGRAM COST PLUS ACTUAL EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS  
(EXCLUDING CHARTER SCHOOLS)

DISTRICT	2007-2008 FUNDED MEM	CURRENT FORMULA			PROPOSED FORMULA			INCREASE/DECREASE	
		2007-2008 FINAL FUNDED PROGRAM COST	2007-2008 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL OPERATIONAL FUNDING	OVERALL ADJUSTMENT	ISQ	2007-2008 CALCULATOR PROGRAM COST		
									AMOUNT
DISTRICTS WITH MEMBERSHIP OF 5,000 OR GREATER									
ALBUQUERQUE	87,530.75	\$611,207,133		\$611,207,133	1.505	1.000	\$670,162,438	\$58,955,305	9.6%
LAS CRUCES	23,324.25	\$159,621,935		\$159,621,935	1.414	1.000	\$168,744,183	\$9,122,248	5.7%
RIO RANCHO	14,679.50	\$99,035,324	\$1,900,000	\$100,935,324	1.359	1.000	\$102,888,390	\$1,953,066	1.9%
GADSDEN	13,830.00	\$94,125,705		\$94,125,705	1.588	1.000	\$112,511,020	\$18,385,315	19.5%
GALLUP-MCKINLEY	12,273.00	\$81,193,548		\$81,193,548	1.602	1.000	\$101,003,512	\$19,809,964	24.4%
SANTA FE	12,258.75	\$79,342,169		\$79,342,169	1.441	1.000	\$89,436,711	\$10,094,542	12.7%
FARMINGTON	10,053.25	\$63,037,883		\$63,037,883	1.409	1.000	\$72,615,119	\$9,577,236	15.2%
ROSWELL	9,203.00	\$63,289,228		\$63,289,228	1.510	1.000	\$71,675,849	\$8,386,621	13.3%
LOS LUNAS	8,606.25	\$61,464,072		\$61,464,072	1.481	1.000	\$65,196,401	\$3,732,329	6.1%
CLOVIS	8,069.00	\$51,184,863		\$51,184,863	1.493	1.000	\$62,023,431	\$10,838,568	21.2%
HOBBS	7,694.50	\$48,162,810		\$48,162,810	1.500	1.000	\$59,346,563	\$11,183,753	23.2%
CENTRAL CONS.	6,626.25	\$48,794,592		\$48,794,592	1.623	1.005	\$55,873,160	\$7,078,568	14.5%
ALAMOGORDO	6,383.50	\$41,874,218		\$41,874,218	1.467	1.000	\$48,299,284	\$6,425,065	15.3%
CARLSBAD	5,883.75	\$46,295,364		\$46,295,364	1.499	1.095	\$49,562,042	\$3,266,678	7.1%
DEMING	5,369.75	\$34,817,703		\$34,817,703	1.621	1.000	\$44,622,228	\$9,804,525	28.2%
DISTRICTS WITH MEMBERSHIP BETWEEN 1,000 AND 5,000									
BELEN	4,728.50	\$32,217,613		\$32,217,613	1.567	1.000	\$38,118,776	\$5,901,163	18.3%
ESPAÑOLA	4,276.25	\$32,650,716		\$32,650,716	1.566	1.000	\$33,906,194	\$1,255,477	3.8%
MORIARTY	3,758.00	\$24,664,870		\$24,664,870	1.525	1.000	\$29,685,190	\$5,020,320	20.4%
GRANTS-CIBOLA	3,607.75	\$27,474,389		\$27,474,389	1.668	1.014	\$31,384,518	\$3,910,129	14.2%
LOS ALAMOS	3,544.50	\$26,565,308		\$26,565,308	1.320	1.016	\$24,493,701	(\$2,071,607)	-7.8%
ARTESIA	3,496.00	\$25,216,520		\$25,216,520	1.515	1.017	\$27,810,605	\$2,594,085	10.3%
BERNALILLO	3,155.00	\$26,852,613		\$26,852,613	1.706	1.020	\$28,345,533	\$1,492,920	5.6%
SILVER CONS.	3,110.50	\$23,145,104		\$23,145,104	1.574	1.049	\$26,376,171	\$3,231,067	14.0%
BLOOMFIELD	3,064.50	\$21,832,199		\$21,832,199	1.612	1.000	\$25,569,375	\$3,737,176	17.1%
AZTEC	3,046.50	\$21,160,732		\$21,160,732	1.546	1.000	\$24,141,132	\$2,980,400	14.1%
LOVINGTON	2,963.25	\$22,664,401		\$22,664,401	1.583	1.000	\$24,497,478	\$1,833,077	8.1%
TAOS	2,889.50	\$19,397,359		\$19,397,359	1.746	1.000	\$25,974,085	\$6,576,726	33.9%
PORTALES	2,801.25	\$19,583,938		\$19,583,938	1.623	1.000	\$23,473,056	\$3,889,118	19.9%
RUIDOSO	2,295.25	\$17,810,064		\$17,810,064	1.668	1.046	\$20,335,020	\$2,524,956	14.2%
LAS VEGAS CITY	2,040.00	\$16,266,783		\$16,266,783	1.705	1.009	\$17,937,842	\$1,671,059	10.3%
POJOAQUE	1,977.50	\$14,281,636		\$14,281,636	1.725	1.000	\$17,517,384	\$3,235,749	22.7%
WEST LAS VEGAS	1,786.50	\$15,128,648	\$607,056	\$15,735,704	1.894	1.000	\$17,253,356	\$1,517,652	9.6%
SOCORRO CONS.	1,736.00	\$12,505,627	\$150,000	\$12,655,627	1.810	1.000	\$16,235,172	\$3,579,545	28.3%
ZUNI	1,518.50	\$12,169,877		\$12,169,877	1.934	1.000	\$14,793,712	\$2,623,835	21.6%
RATON	1,428.00	\$10,914,029		\$10,914,029	1.750	1.000	\$12,842,309	\$1,928,280	17.7%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	1,418.00	\$10,940,219		\$10,940,219	1.861	1.000	\$13,674,833	\$2,734,614	25.0%
COBRE CONS.	1,412.75	\$13,723,460		\$13,723,460	1.871	1.028	\$14,073,287	\$349,827	2.5%
HATCH VALLEY	1,405.50	\$10,344,592		\$10,344,592	2.002	1.002	\$14,457,908	\$4,113,316	39.8%
DEXTER	1,096.00	\$8,140,900		\$8,140,900	1.963	1.000	\$11,083,049	\$2,942,149	36.1%
TUCUMCARI	1,045.50	\$8,208,411		\$8,208,411	1.958	1.000	\$10,703,861	\$2,495,451	30.4%
ESTANCIA	1,012.50	\$8,336,077		\$8,336,077	1.901	1.000	\$9,872,192	\$1,536,115	18.4%
TULAROSA	1,006.00	\$7,990,064		\$7,990,064	1.858	1.020	\$9,764,522	\$1,774,458	22.2%

ATTACHMENT 2

PROPOSED PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO  
2007-2008 FINAL FUNDED PROGRAM COST PLUS ACTUAL EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS  
(EXCLUDING CHARTER SCHOOLS)

DISTRICT	2007-2008 FUNDED MEM	CURRENT FORMULA			PROPOSED FORMULA			INCREASE/DECREASE	
		2007-2008 FINAL FUNDED PROGRAM COST	2007-2008 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL OPERATIONAL FUNDING	OVERALL ADJUSTMENT	ISQ	2007-2008 CALCULATOR PROGRAM COST		
		AMOUNT	PERCENT						
DISTRICTS WITH MEMBERSHIP LESS THAN 1,000									
PECOS	737.75	\$8,185,164		\$8,185,164	2.123	1.003	\$8,117,972	(\$67,191)	-0.8%
LORDSBURG	697.25	\$6,406,065		\$6,406,065	2.087	1.000	\$7,553,831	\$1,147,766	17.9%
CUBA	671.75	\$6,355,221		\$6,355,221	2.481	1.000	\$8,500,561	\$2,145,340	33.8%
SANTA ROSA	658.75	\$6,510,851		\$6,510,851	2.213	1.000	\$7,502,663	\$991,811	15.2%
DULCE	650.00	\$5,146,734		\$5,146,734	2.194	1.000	\$7,320,432	\$2,173,698	42.2%
MORA	594.50	\$5,425,872		\$5,425,872	2.245	1.000	\$6,895,689	\$1,469,817	27.1%
PEÑASCO	586.00	\$5,685,116		\$5,685,116	2.287	1.027	\$7,106,084	\$1,420,968	25.0%
EUNICE	573.50	\$4,156,889		\$4,156,889	2.114	1.000	\$6,314,935	\$2,158,046	51.9%
LOVING	567.50	\$5,194,790		\$5,194,790	2.265	1.023	\$6,785,528	\$1,590,738	30.6%
CAPTAN	561.75	\$4,464,909		\$4,464,909	2.104	1.000	\$6,102,309	\$1,637,400	36.7%
CLAYTON	529.00	\$4,958,359		\$4,958,359	2.086	1.000	\$5,736,152	\$777,793	15.7%
TEXICO	518.25	\$4,688,690		\$4,688,690	2.117	1.071	\$6,095,030	\$1,406,340	30.0%
CLOUDCROFT	467.25	\$4,282,703		\$4,282,703	2.187	1.021	\$5,349,625	\$1,066,923	24.9%
CHAMA VALLEY	454.50	\$4,929,042	\$195,057	\$5,124,099	2.316	1.015	\$5,556,073	\$431,974	8.4%
MESA VISTA	452.00	\$4,768,282		\$4,768,282	2.426	1.003	\$5,580,071	\$811,789	17.0%
HAGERMAN	446.00	\$3,949,326		\$3,949,326	2.379	1.000	\$5,381,493	\$1,432,167	36.3%
CIMARRON	444.25	\$4,666,865		\$4,666,865	2.132	1.023	\$5,013,890	\$347,025	7.4%
QUESTA	425.75	\$4,621,356	\$110,000	\$4,731,356	2.471	1.006	\$5,401,672	\$670,316	14.2%
MAGDALENA	422.75	\$4,622,124		\$4,622,124	2.352	1.000	\$5,236,827	\$614,704	13.3%
JAL	422.50	\$3,769,019		\$3,769,019	2.288	1.011	\$5,183,957	\$1,414,938	37.5%
MOUNTAINAIR	351.00	\$3,475,681		\$3,475,681	2.487	1.000	\$4,463,556	\$987,875	28.4%
JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	341.00	\$3,655,753		\$3,655,753	2.579	1.000	\$4,490,475	\$834,722	22.8%
JEMEZ VALLEY	313.00	\$3,301,462		\$3,301,462	2.610	1.000	\$4,204,029	\$902,567	27.3%
FT. SUMNER	311.75	\$3,181,406	\$285,000	\$3,466,406	2.332	1.045	\$3,975,698	\$509,293	14.7%
TATUM	275.00	\$2,973,174		\$2,973,174	2.560	1.087	\$3,893,351	\$920,177	30.9%
ANIMAS	259.50	\$2,893,450		\$2,893,450	2.684	1.077	\$3,853,087	\$959,636	33.2%
FLOYD	256.00	\$2,384,646		\$2,384,646	2.649	1.000	\$3,502,617	\$1,117,971	46.9%
LOGAN	222.00	\$2,457,286	\$120,000	\$2,577,286	2.700	1.053	\$3,439,040	\$861,754	33.4%
MELROSE	215.75	\$2,336,521		\$2,336,521	2.461	1.010	\$2,918,594	\$582,073	24.9%
CARRIZOZO	202.50	\$2,283,001		\$2,283,001	2.853	1.027	\$3,006,389	\$723,387	31.7%
SPRINGER	200.50	\$2,210,567	\$288,000	\$2,498,567	2.768	1.000	\$2,910,902	\$412,335	16.5%
DORA	199.75	\$2,609,834		\$2,609,834	2.588	1.056	\$2,888,353	\$278,518	10.7%
QUEMADO	188.00	\$1,970,399	\$40,000	\$2,010,399	2.883	1.000	\$2,767,607	\$757,208	37.7%
RESERVE	177.00	\$2,143,747	\$60,000	\$2,203,747	2.902	1.000	\$2,681,709	\$477,962	21.7%
WAGON MOUND	157.50	\$2,030,966	\$425,000	\$2,455,966	3.346	1.000	\$2,707,779	\$251,814	10.3%
LAKE ARTHUR	157.00	\$1,657,371	\$645,000	\$2,302,371	3.196	1.000	\$2,545,835	\$243,464	10.6%
SAN JON	149.25	\$1,696,005		\$1,696,005	3.181	1.063	\$2,598,670	\$902,664	53.2%
ELIDA	135.75	\$1,436,151	\$100,000	\$1,536,151	2.875	1.000	\$2,047,465	\$511,314	33.3%
GRADY	133.50	\$1,459,644	\$264,300	\$1,723,944	2.878	1.000	\$2,006,055	\$282,111	16.4%
DES MOINES	127.00	\$1,323,061	\$237,000	\$1,560,061	3.155	1.000	\$2,029,584	\$469,524	30.1%
HONDO VALLEY	126.50	\$1,336,880	\$564,000	\$1,900,880	3.301	1.000	\$2,131,927	\$231,047	12.2%
HOUSE	122.00	\$1,303,429	\$125,422	\$1,428,851	3.550	1.000	\$2,193,030	\$764,179	53.5%
MAXWELL	103.50	\$1,210,705	\$413,000	\$1,623,705	3.466	1.027	\$1,916,602	\$292,896	18.0%
VAUGHN	97.75	\$1,350,614	\$370,000	\$1,720,614	3.529	1.000	\$1,774,781	\$54,167	3.1%
CORONA	89.00	\$1,054,509	\$518,300	\$1,572,809	3.614	1.000	\$1,651,705	\$78,897	5.0%
ROY	67.50	\$1,041,550	\$305,000	\$1,346,550	4.179	1.000	\$1,429,607	\$83,058	6.2%
MOSQUERO	40.50	\$554,012	\$450,000	\$1,004,012	4.374	1.000	\$915,685	(\$88,327)	-8.8%
STATEWIDE	313,305.50	\$2,231,751,895	\$8,172,135	\$2,239,924,030			\$2,539,959,517	\$300,035,487	13.4%

# **IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STAFF**

## **DISTRICTS WITH MEMBERSHIP OF 5,000 OR GREATER**

	A	B	C = B - A
PERSONNEL	CURRENT FTE	PROPOSED FTE	INCREASE/ DECREASE
Teachers	12,880.27	13,362.27	482.00
Principals	527.75	557.75	30.00
Counselors	511.59	595.09	83.50
Nurses	274.67	319.67	45.00
Physical Education Teachers	315.18	344.18	29.00
Art and Music Teachers	623.75	745.75	122.00
Social Workers	245.25	273.25	28.00
Librarians	229.45	290.45	61.00
Advanced Placement Teachers	206.85	253.85	47.00
Gifted Education	360.14	406.14	46.00
Intervention Specialists	112.33	352.33	240.00
Bilingual Education	521.94	567.84	45.90
Educational Assistants	3,914.08	3,942.08	28.00
Special Education Teachers (excluding gifted)	2,282.89	2,298.89	16.00
Ancillary and Support Staff	963.10	987.10	24.00
Maintenance and Operations Staff (including custodians)	2,006.88	2,251.88	245.00
Data Entry Clerks	237.00	274.00	37.00
Other Central Office Staff	1,278.24	1,337.44	59.20
Other School-based Staff	1,211.30	1,248.00	36.70
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28,702.66</b>	<b>30,407.96</b>	<b>1,705.30</b>

**NOTE:** The following school districts are included in this table: Alamogordo, Albuquerque, Carlsbad, Central Consolidated, Clovis, Deming, Farmington, Gadsden, Gallup-McKinley, Hobbs, Las Cruces, Los Lunas, Rio Rancho, Roswell, and Santa Fe.

## **DISTRICTS WITH MEMBERSHIP BETWEEN 1,000 AND 5,000**

	A	B	C = B - A
PERSONNEL	CURRENT FTE	PROPOSED FTE	INCREASE/ DECREASE
Teachers	2,412.82	2,573.52	160.70
Principals	147.50	172.00	24.50
Counselors	113.02	150.02	37.00
Nurses	58.68	95.93	37.25
Physical Education Teachers	123.88	149.50	25.62
Art and Music Teachers	139.84	187.65	47.81
Social Workers	46.95	74.50	27.55
Librarians	45.74	70.49	24.75
Advanced Placement Teachers	26.00	52.30	26.30
Gifted Education	53.78	78.53	24.75
Intervention Specialists	17.78	158.28	140.50
Bilingual Education	219.33	263.00	43.67
Educational Assistants	619.20	664.20	45.00
Special Education Teachers (excluding gifted)	432.71	446.71	14.00
Ancillary and Support Staff	178.63	188.83	10.20
Maintenance and Operations Staff (including custodians)	559.40	602.15	42.75
Data Entry Clerks	116.90	124.50	7.60
Other Central Office Staff	225.57	235.57	10.00
Other School-based Staff	201.60	245.85	44.25
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,739.33</b>	<b>6,533.53</b>	<b>794.20</b>

**NOTE:** The following school districts are included in this table: Artesia, Aztec, Belen, Bernalillo, Bloomfield, Coble Consolidated, Dexter, Española, Estancia, Grants-Cibola, Hatch Valley, Los Alamos, Lovington, Moriarty, Portales, Raton, Ruidoso, Silver Consolidated, Socorro, Truth or Consequences, Tucumcari, Tularosa, West Las Vegas, and Zuni. The following districts in this group did not provide a response: Las Vegas City, Pojoaque, and Taos.

# **IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STAFF**

## **DISTRICTS WITH MEMBERSHIP LESS THAN 1,000**

	A	B	C = B - A
PERSONNEL	CURRENT FTE	PROPOSED FTE	INCREASE/ DECREASE
Teachers	803.01	915.83	112.82
Principals	63.25	74.75	11.50
Counselors	39.95	66.17	26.22
Nurses	21.89	38.75	16.86
Physical Education Teachers	42.71	58.96	16.25
Art and Music Teachers	34.90	62.24	27.34
Social Workers	4.99	27.75	22.76
Librarians	19.80	38.15	18.35
Advanced Placement Teachers	4.97	16.62	11.65
Gifted Education	3.76	17.71	13.95
Intervention Specialists	10.00	60.57	50.57
Bilingual Education	46.16	71.15	24.99
Educational Assistants	191.50	209.00	17.50
Special Education Teachers (excluding gifted)	116.16	131.90	15.74
Ancillary and Support Staff	60.71	75.16	14.45
Maintenance and Operations Staff (including custodians)	174.00	199.55	25.55
Data Entry Clerks	22.25	34.75	12.50
Other Central Office Staff	121.53	140.43	18.90
Other School-based Staff	94.48	115.73	21.25
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,876.02</b>	<b>2,355.17</b>	<b>479.15</b>

**NOTE:** The following school districts are included in this table: Animas, Capitan, Carrizozo, Chama Valley, Cimarron, Clayton, Cloudcroft, Corona, Cuba, Des Moines, Dora, Dulce, Elida, Eunice, Floyd, Fort Sumner, Grady, Hagerman, Hondo Valley, House, Jal, Jemez Mountain, Jemez Valley, Lake Arthur, Logan, Lordsburg, Loving, Magdalena, Maxwell, Melrose, Mesa Vista, Mora, Mountainair, Pecos, Peñasco, Quemado, Questa, Reserve, Roy, San Jon, Santa Rosa, Springer, Tatum, Texico, Vaughn, and Wagon Mound. The following district in this group did not provide a response: Mosquero.

**TOTAL PROJECTED INCREASE IN PERSONNEL      2,978.65**

**STUDENTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT**  
**STUDENTS IN PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT**  
**BASED ON THE 2007-2008 120-DAY STARS REPORT (excludes charter schools)**

District	120-Day Total Enrollment	Special Education Service Level*				Total Special Education Excluding Gifted	Percent Special Education	Greater Than 16%	Gifted Service Level*				Total Gifted	Percent Gifted
		A	B	C	D				A	B	C	D		
DISTRICTS WITH ENROLLMENT OF 5,000 OR GREATER														
ALBUQUERQUE	87,627	1,042	3,293	2,000	5,423	11,758	13.4%		813	3,443	188	19	4,463	5.1%
LAS CRUCES	23,595	689	968	768	1,198	3,623	15.4%		1,681	34	0	0	1,715	7.3%
RIO RANCHO	15,585	381	212	549	828	1,970	12.6%		253	368	0	0	621	4.0%
GADSDEN	13,859	430	507	538	377	1,852	13.4%		188	34	0	0	222	1.6%
GALLUP-MCKINLEY	12,528	286	398	301	420	1,405	11.2%		99	233	1	0	333	2.7%
SANTA FE	12,268	354	632	413	357	1,756	14.3%		95	276	0	0	371	3.0%
FARMINGTON	10,141	234	475	251	310	1,270	12.5%		85	439	0	0	524	5.2%
ROSWELL	9,378	331	601	182	436	1,550	16.5%	Yes	121	504	0	20	645	6.9%
LOS LUNAS	8,528	455	293	269	287	1,304	15.3%		148	57	58	0	263	3.1%
CLOVIS	8,056	303	390	179	226	1,098	13.6%		363	0	0	0	363	4.5%
HOBBS	7,827	258	257	117	261	893	11.4%		219	0	0	0	219	2.8%
CENTRAL CONS.	6,859	170	349	293	317	1,129	16.5%	Yes	304	56	0	0	360	5.2%
ALAMOGORDO	6,344	324	262	202	268	1,056	16.6%	Yes	173	134	0	0	307	4.8%
CARLSBAD	5,898	253	270	237	207	967	16.4%	Yes	376	2	0	0	378	6.4%
DEMING	5,302	133	167	122	171	593	11.2%		100	12	0	0	112	2.1%
DISTRICTS WITH ENROLLMENT BETWEEN 1,000 AND 5,000														
BELEN	4,712	228	252	208	241	929	19.7%	Yes	68	6	0	0	74	1.6%
ESPANOLA	4,230	166	133	88	103	490	11.6%		29	0	0	0	29	0.7%
GRANTS-CIBOLA	3,619	120	143	96	166	525	14.5%		41	12	0	0	53	1.5%
MORIARTY	3,589	100	169	126	66	461	12.8%		100	108	0	0	208	5.8%
ARTESIA	3,497	174	158	132	139	603	17.2%	Yes	78	30	0	0	108	3.1%
LOS ALAMOS	3,466	155	190	83	195	623	18.0%	Yes	441	20	0	0	461	13.3%
BERNALILLO	3,176	40	138	173	206	557	17.5%	Yes	6	58	0	0	64	2.0%
LOVINGTON	3,168	141	100	69	229	539	17.0%	Yes	45	125	0	0	170	5.4%
BLOOMFIELD	3,115	137	186	127	132	582	18.7%	Yes	143	51	0	0	194	6.2%
SILVER CITY	3,106	96	146	107	54	403	13.0%		32	33	0	0	65	2.1%
AZTEC	3,030	106	160	187	146	599	19.8%	Yes	57	23	0	0	80	2.6%
PORTALES	2,811	147	95	98	114	454	16.2%	Yes	41	16	0	0	57	2.0%
TAOS	2,756	108	90	78	185	461	16.7%	Yes	71	70	0	0	141	5.1%
RUIDOSO	2,239	62	129	66	55	312	13.9%		78	0	0	0	78	3.5%
LAS VEGAS CITY	2,035	90	129	75	54	348	17.1%	Yes	61	58	0	0	119	5.8%
POJOAQUE	1,994	31	180	88	46	345	17.3%	Yes	9	36	0	0	45	2.3%
SOCORRO CONS.	1,767	93	95	46	62	296	16.8%	Yes	30	34	0	0	64	3.6%
WEST LAS VEGAS	1,691	65	56	56	39	216	12.8%		21	0	0	0	21	1.2%
ZUNI	1,499	62	81	39	34	216	14.4%		3	0	0	0	3	0.2%
TRUTH OR CONSEQ.	1,452	48	94	66	65	273	18.8%	Yes	69	2	0	0	71	4.9%
COBRE CONS.	1,415	56	90	60	60	266	18.8%	Yes	10	2	0	0	12	0.8%
HATCH VALLEY	1,388	63	51	16	30	160	11.5%		5	0	0	0	5	0.4%
RATON	1,353	74	72	40	50	236	17.4%	Yes	0	18	0	0	18	1.3%
DEXTER	1,087	83	55	14	27	179	16.5%	Yes	9	45	0	0	54	5.0%
TUCUMCARI	1,065	54	24	25	88	191	17.9%	Yes	10	19	0	0	29	2.7%
ESTANCIA	1,031	55	46	19	15	135	13.1%		19	9	0	0	28	2.7%
TULAROSA**	977	25	45	15	18	103	10.5%		11	6	0	0	17	1.7%
DISTRICTS WITH ENROLLMENT LESS THAN 1,000														
DULCE	733	4	36	37	19	96	13.1%		1	0	0	0	1	0.1%
PECOS	720	51	88	9	25	173	24.0%	Yes	18	0	0	0	18	2.5%
CUBA	701	25	36	21	29	111	15.8%		4	0	0	0	4	0.6%
LORDSBURG	686	33	30	19	47	129	18.8%	Yes	8	3	0	0	11	1.6%
SANTA ROSA	634	2	15	34	22	73	11.5%		5	0	0	0	5	0.8%
MORA	573	31	29	12	11	83	14.5%		7	7	0	0	14	2.4%
LOVING	564	24	22	7	15	68	12.1%		6	0	0	0	6	1.1%

STUDENTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT  
STUDENTS IN PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT  
BASED ON THE 2007-2008 120-DAY STARS REPORT (excludes charter schools)

District	120-Day Total Enrollment	Special Education Service Level*				Total Special Education Excluding Gifted	Percent Special Education	Greater Than 16%	Gifted Service Level*				Total Gifted	Percent Gifted
		A	B	C	D				A	B	C	D		
53 EUNICE	557	20	42	10	8	80	14.4%		7	0	0	0	7	1.3%
54 CLAYTON	552	26	36	7	18	87	15.8%		3	0	0	0	3	0.5%
55 PENASCO	541	22	15	19	24	80	14.8%		7	2	0	0	9	1.7%
56 CAPITAN	540	10	29	3	6	48	8.9%		1	0	0	0	1	0.2%
57 TEXICO	524	27	16	5	14	62	11.8%		7	0	0	0	7	1.3%
58 CLOUDCROFT	461	18	28	7	9	62	13.4%		25	7	0	0	32	6.9%
59 CIMARRON	455	24	26	3	12	65	14.3%		4	1	0	0	5	1.1%
60 HAGERMAN	447	20	37	10	15	82	18.3%	Yes	10	0	0	0	10	2.2%
61 MAGDALENA	447	16	29	17	25	87	19.5%	Yes	6	3	0	0	9	2.0%
62 CHAMA VALLEY	434	38	15	6	16	75	17.3%	Yes	8	1	0	0	9	2.1%
63 JAL	432	27	9	9	27	72	16.7%	Yes	6	0	0	0	6	1.4%
64 QUESTA	427	22	15	24	10	71	16.6%	Yes	1	0	0	0	1	0.2%
65 MESA VISTA	424	18	26	8	12	64	15.1%		6	0	0	0	6	1.4%
66 JEMEZ MOUNTAIN	343	13	2	13	8	36	10.5%		2	0	0	0	2	0.6%
67 MOUNTAINAIR	329	14	21	11	14	60	18.2%	Yes	4	0	0	0	4	1.2%
68 FT SUMNER	325	34	9	6	19	68	20.9%	Yes	21	0	0	0	21	6.5%
69 JEMEZ VALLEY	325	8	22	12	9	51	15.7%		7	0	0	0	7	2.2%
70 TATUM	319	6	18	2	21	47	14.7%		2	0	0	0	2	0.6%
71 ANIMAS	274	7	15	7	14	43	15.7%		9	1	0	0	10	3.6%
72 FLOYD	249	21	13	5	10	49	19.7%	Yes	4	0	0	0	4	1.6%
73 DORA	242	13	18	1	18	50	20.7%	Yes	5	0	0	0	5	2.1%
74 LOGAN	226	14	10	2	10	36	15.9%		0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
75 MELROSE	219	19	9	1	22	51	23.3%	Yes	11	3	0	0	14	6.4%
76 CARRIZOZO	204	5	14	1	3	23	11.3%		2	0	0	0	2	1.0%
77 SPRINGER	196	13	17	1	0	31	15.8%		0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
78 RESERVE	185	4	12	10	16	42	22.7%	Yes	4	0	0	0	4	2.2%
79 QUEMADO	173	3	6	2	1	12	6.9%		1	0	0	0	1	0.6%
80 WAGON MOUND	160	10	3	0	79	92	57.5%	Yes	1	0	0	0	1	0.6%
81 LAKE ARTHUR	158	10	9	2	9	30	19.0%	Yes	1	0	0	0	1	0.6%
82 SAN JON	152	14	6	0	6	26	17.1%	Yes	2	0	0	0	2	1.3%
83 GRADY	133	7	7	0	9	23	17.3%	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
84 HONDO VALLEY	127	4	6	1	1	12	9.4%		3	1	0	0	4	3.1%
85 ELIDA	117	15	2	0	4	21	17.9%	Yes	2	0	0	0	2	1.7%
86 HOUSE	113	6	4	1	5	16	14.2%		0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
87 MAXWELL	99	11	8	0	5	24	24.2%	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
88 VAUGHN	98	6	9	2	3	20	20.4%	Yes	1	0	0	0	1	1.0%
89 DES MOINES	93	2	3	1	1	7	7.5%		1	0	0	0	1	1.1%
90 ROY	85	11	0	0	0	11	12.9%		1	0	0	0	1	1.2%
91 CORONA	82	4	4	0	1	9	11.0%		3	0	0	0	3	3.7%
92 MOSQUERO	38	4	4	0	0	8	21.1%	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
93 STATEWIDE	314,979	8,958	13,011	8,966	14,357	45,292	14.4%	42	6,732	6,402	247	39	13,420	4.3%

\* Service Levels:

Level A = Less than 10% of the day

Level B = 11% to 49% of the day

Level C = 50% of the day or more but not a full day

Level D = Up to a full day or program 3Y/4Y/5Y (DD)

\*\* Although the 120-day enrollment for Tularosa is below 1,000, the district's 2007-2008 final funded membership was 1,006. Therefore, for the purposes of summarizing responses to the questions and making other comparisons regarding the proposed funding formula, the district is included with the group of districts having a membership between 1,000 and 5,000.

**OTHER ISSUES: SCHOOL DISTRICT RESPONSES TO QUESTION 16**

**MEMBERSHIP OF 5,000 OR GREATER**

**Alamogordo Municipal Schools:** High School Redesign is a critical issue facing New Mexico schools. Adequate funding support for this initiative must be of the highest priority. We must redesign our High Schools to create pathways to success for each and every one of our students. The economic status of our state is dependent upon this action. This initiative must be a collaborative effort between government, business/industry, public education, and higher education.

**Albuquerque Public Schools:** The goal must be to channel as many resources to the classroom as possible. However, in doing this, there is almost always an increasing need for support services. This is rarely seen as essential. A sweeping initiative such as the funding formula will necessarily carry with it new accountability demands and that will fall on the school staff members if the instructional support infrastructure is not maintained.

**Carlsbad Municipal Schools:** Carlsbad Municipal Schools has already taken steps to link accountability over the budget to the EPSS Plan. We have utilized the Chart of Accounts mandated by PED to begin tracking budget and expenditures to the program level. In January 2009, we will begin a new Budget Development process that will be driven on program needs and will roll up into the District Budget document as required by the PED.

**Clovis Municipal Schools:** In tough economic times, it is even MORE critical that we take care of our most vulnerable and important population – our children. The current economic crisis should be an additional incentive to make sure we are properly funding the education of the future of our nation.

**Deming Public Schools:** Bilingual Education – New Mexico is a bilingual, multicultural community. In community across the state, such as Deming, a true bilingual education is essential for the success of our students. Schools must continue to provide instruction, which will develop skills in English and Spanish and other Native American languages. We must not move to an English only or English immersion environment. Title III from the Federal Government provides for instruction in English acquisition. It does not support the native language. The New Mexico taxpayers must continue to support the essential learning of a dual language community.

**Farmington Municipal Schools:** The implementation of the proposed funding formula would allow the Farmington district to plan long term. Currently, we plan for the present with the funding we have because of the uncertainty of future funding.

In order for us to provide the education necessary for all students to be successful, we must be able to have the resources for hiring the necessary staff, providing the staff with the tools they need to be successful in their classrooms and to implement the programs needed to

ensure student success. All of these require a long term commitment that we will only be able to make with the assurance of sufficient funding in the years to come.

**Gadsden Independent Schools:**

- GISD has opened 5 elementaries and a new high school in the past four years. Unfunded operational costs have a huge negative impact on the budget.
- All Gadsden programs are limited by enormous transportation costs. More funding for busing is needed for career-technical, after school enrichment, and Pre-K programs.

**Gallup-McKinley County Public Schools:** GMCS is beginning to turn the corner in increasing the academic achievement of its students. With reduced funding, GMCS will be less able to provide research-based professional development, instruction practices, and necessary support for all of its students to succeed. GMCS has 38% English Language Learners, 81% Native American students, 9% Hispanic students, 13% Special Education students, and 9,095 or 79.74% students in poverty. GMCS is asking for the necessary financial support so that all students may succeed in school, and that the doors of opportunity may be opened to them in their lifetimes.

**Hobbs Municipal Schools:** Utility increases (\$400,000) including fuel costs in general and to fund student travel such as athletic trips.

**Las Cruces Public Schools:** Over the past few years, the percentage of the state budget dedicated to public education has dropped while at the same time public schools are being held to higher accountability standards and increased directives from the federal and state government. LCPS is committed to providing a world-class education to its students. We strongly support the passage of the funding formula bill as developed.

**Los Lunas Public Schools:** As a Superintendent of Schools, I would recommend the following to LESC:

- The recommendations made to the New Mexico Legislature from the American Diploma Project, which specifically align the state's curriculum to the highest performing states should be adopted in their entirety;
- New Mexico should develop end of course examinations in the four key content areas and make a passing grade a requirement to graduate from high school;
- The Public Education Department, in concert with the legislature, should develop an annual report card for each New Mexico school and district that measures other indicators of school success beyond AYP;
- The state should consider the development of intermediate units of PED that provide technical assistance to schools and districts. The professional development of our mid-career teachers is a glaring need across the state. Without providing this resources to schools and districts, small and isolated district will be at a distinct disadvantage in retraining their staff.
- Leadership is critical to school improvement. The recommendations that are presented from Senate Joint Memorial 3 should be adopted, and the state should make an investment in both practicing and aspiring administrators:



- Present legislation that makes school leadership a fiscal and policy priority of the 2009 New Mexico Legislative Session;
- Identify a partner organization that can immediately implement a Leadership Training Institute in New Mexico with the goal of training New Mexico educators to sustain the program into the future;
- Build a cadre of trainers and turnaround specialists to support schools and their leaders; and
- Require that PED and all districts across New Mexico have a written plan for school leadership that includes recruitment, training, and support of school leaders.

### **Rio Rancho Public Schools:**

1. Space to house programs and services: The vast majority of school districts in New Mexico are stable or declining in enrollment and may have the space to house the staff and programs recommended by the Task Force study. But for a few districts that are growing, space is at a premium. Some consideration may need to be given to how space can be provided to house these programs. This also has implications for funding in the facilities management, maintenance and operations, and custodial arenas.
2. Opening new schools: The Task Force study acknowledges that school districts have operational expenses that are incurred the year before a new school opens that should be funded. These include the need to bring on a principal and a small support staff during the year before the school opens to work with the community, prepare curricula, and hire teachers, as well as some supply and other expenses. The study recommends that the legislature provide money to districts opening new schools through the existing New School Development Fund. However, HB 241 as amended did not include any provision for assuring that this actually occurs. The \$3 million in funds identified in SB 146 (the 2008 Public School Capital Outlay Omnibus Bill) to help with opening new schools can only be used for capital expenses. This certainly helps districts opening new schools, but does not solve the issue of funding pre-opening operational expenses. Provisions assuring the New School Development Fund is in fact funded should be included in the funding formula/finance reform bill.
3. Elimination of student fees: In many districts, students/parents are increasingly asked to pay fees for elective courses (with some exceptions for those who cannot afford to pay) because districts cannot fund the programs any other way. These fees should be paid by districts wherever possible except for those courses that produce products that students consume or keep.
4. Employee Related Costs: As schools add instructional programs and the staff needed to support those programs, costs for services provided to employees increase. Some of these costs are direct and some are indirect. Examples of these services are:
  - Recruiting and hiring highly qualified staff to replace those who retire or resign. (Estimates vary, but some figures estimate the cost of replacing an employee can be up to 1.5 times or more of the employee's salary.)
  - Processing costs for new employees
  - Servicing needs for employees, such as the employee assistance program, FMLA compliance, ADA compliance, Worker's Compensation compliance, etc.
  - Increasing legal costs as staff grows
  - Increasing union issues that develop as the staff grows

- Increasing needs supervision and evaluation of staff in order to improve instruction and in order to minimize litigation
- Increasing operational funding for mentor program (operational now pays approximately ½ of the mentor program costs and the State mentor grant pays approximately ½)
- Funds for a principal mentoring program

**Roswell Independent Schools:** As stated, the districts and communities are unique. This district does not have centralized heating and cooling systems throughout all our schools. Ten of our schools lack the proper cooling for additional days. As we stand now, many classrooms in May, August, and September are 90+ degrees and very uncomfortable. In other parts of the state this may not be an issue, but it is here. A cost estimate to bring these ten schools to the proper level of heating and cooling is \$20,000,000. We do have an 8-year plan to remodel our school district. We have just finished one building and are starting on two more this summer. As construction costs continue to rise the third school we planned to remodel will not be upgraded during this bond cycle. Our newest school building, for your information, was built in 1965 and our oldest school still in use is more than 100 years old. Our district is at max capacity in the following areas: network backbone (need fiber cost of 3.5 million), need to replace many old portables and new classrooms.

**Santa Fe Public Schools:** The implementation of the proposed funding formula would allow the Santa Fe Public Schools to engage in long term planning without the threat of reduced or inadequate funding.

In order for us to provide the education necessary for all students to be successful, we must be able to have the resources for planning, preparation and professional development of existing staff and providing the staff with the tools they need to be successful in their classrooms and to implement the programs needed to ensure student success. All of these require a long term commitment that we will only be able to make with the assurance of sufficient funding in the years to come.

### **MEMBERSHIP FROM 1,000 TO 4,999**

**Artesia Public Schools:** According to New Mexico's Constitution, it is the responsibility of the Governor and the Legislature to fund education at a sufficient level. The 2-year study on sufficiency has indicated that the Governor and the Legislature have not funded public education to a sufficient level. I totally expect the Legislature and the Governor to make sufficient funding of public education their number one priority for the 2009 legislative session.

**Belen Consolidated Schools:** Public trust is a concern for public school districts across the nation. Like most districts, Belen struggles to compete with private, charter, home schools and other public school districts in the area. There is a perception that public schools cannot and do not provide high quality services and sufficient education to their clients. Until the time that funding is sufficient so that PTRs can be reduced, the quality of buildings and furniture improved, and the programs can be expanded to meet all children's needs and

interests, public trust will continue to be a problem, a problem that results in decreased attendance and increased dropout rates. America's, and New Mexico's, public schools should be the premier learning centers in our country, in our state. Until busses can deliver students to attractive, well-staffed facilities, public trust will remain a factor in how well our schools perform.

**Bernalillo Public Schools:** Cash balance restrictions need to be eliminated to allow school districts to keep much needed cash balances and provide the needed services to students.

**Cobre Consolidated Schools:** It is imperative that a higher % of new taxes go towards education in the state. This is the most important aspect of this process. The educational systems of the state are in dire need of additional funds and there needs to be a concerted effort to return to \$.50 out of every new tax dollar going towards education.

**Dexter Consolidated Schools:** This funding would give us the dollars year after year to do those things we KNOW make a difference...the PROVEN things to do the best job we can for our kids. We could depend on the funding annually and build strong schools instead of starting good programs and then losing the funding.

**Española Public Schools:** Not enough funding to make changes.

**Grants-Cibola County Schools:** If this sufficiency funding becomes a reality, it will initiate true school reform. The Grants/Cibola County School District is committed to true school reform by partnering with other school agencies within Cibola County. We are currently working under the guidance of an MOU with the following non-public schools educational agencies: Laguna Department of Education, Sky City Community School, and Saint Joseph Mission School. Within our county it is NOT uncommon for families to have students enrolled in 2 or more educational agencies at any given time.

**Hatch Valley Public Schools:** Hatch Valley Public Schools Board of Education, students and staff appreciate the opportunity to be considered as equal participants in New Mexico Education. As superintendent of the district, not a day goes past that I have concerns about meeting the needs of our students. During my 17 years as superintendent, I have watched the old formula become difficult to accept on providing sufficient funding with equality for our students. Times have changed and so must we.

**Los Alamos Public Schools:**

- Since the proposed formula funds students at risk, then GATE [Gifted and Talented Education] students should be funded as a separate multiplier in the new formula because these students are at GREAT RISK. If you read the studies that have been conducted about these students they are at high risk for suicide. They are not appreciated in our society and are often isolated and bullied by their classmates and at times even by their teachers.
- While the proposed formula is said to be a SIMPLE formula it is not. The current formula is VERY TRANSPARENT – it is not easy for anyone to see and to understand EXACTLY how much money a district receives to provide services globally and individually across the district. The proposed formula is purported to include funding for

the arts, counselors, Special Education, Gifted and Talented students, Librarians, Support services and the like, it is impossible to see where this happens. The current formula shows this is a CLEAN and TRANSPARENT WAY. In the new formula, too much is left to "faith."

- There appears to be a mistake in the way the formula was entered into the calculator. After creating my own calculator using the formula and finding a discrepancy in the numbers, I asked two high school math teachers to look at the formula, at my spread sheet, and at the calculator. They concluded that there was a mistake in the way the formula was entered into the calculator provided by the LESC. Finally, I approached a member of my board who is a mathematician and he came to the same conclusion. His explanation of the error is found as an attachment to this document.
- It is said that the new formula makes it harder to CHASE; however we believe that the proposed formula leaves itself open to the same problems. The only way to eliminate the possibility of a district or a person "chasing the formula" is to provide a systematic audit, not only of the dollars but also of the way districts document and check documentation for students who fall into the populations that qualify for additional funding.

In conclusion, we would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide our input. We reiterate that we support the efforts of the state legislature to attempt to provide adequate education to all our residents. However, we would like to repeat that without amendments including a hold harmless clause into perpetuity and a provision for gifted students under SPED, we cannot support this new legislation.

**Ruidoso Municipal Schools:** We appreciate the legislature researching the funding formula and seeking input from the districts. In order for us to provide quality public education for our students we must have resources to hire necessary staff and provide them the tools they need to be successful in their classrooms and to improve student achievement.

**Silver Consolidated Schools:** I want the taxpayers and the legislature to know that I appreciate everything that you have done to support education in New Mexico, and in the Silver District in particular.

I also want you to know that I feel that I would not be doing my job as Superintendent if I did not do everything that I could to ensure that all of my students receive their constitutionally mandated "sufficient education." It is my sincere belief that to provide this sufficient education, we need to fund schools at the level and with the distribution described by the Funding Formula Task Force Study.

I know that you will do everything that you can to support this funding, and rest assured, that I will do everything I can to ensure this funding and distribution is implemented.

**Tucumcari Public Schools:** Schools and districts will need to secure the funds to provide a sufficient education to their students, whether through the enactment of the Funding Formula Task Force's proposal (which reflects a proactive approach on behalf of the legislature) or by the continuation of "supplemental emergency appropriations" (which reflect, on the contrary, the refusal of the legislature to remedy insufficiency for the long term).

Tucumcari Public Schools recommends the adoption and full (or phased-in) funding of the revised public school funding formula.

**West Las Vegas Public Schools:** The district has been fortunate to meet AYP at elementary sites but without additional funds the systems put in place will break down if we are unable to provide the same level of support for sustainability.

**Zuni Public Schools:** The implementation of the proposed funding formula would allow the Zuni Public School District to plan long term. Currently, we plan for the present with the funding we have because of the uncertainty of future funding. We cannot continue to rely on 'soft' federal funds, special awards and grants, Medicaid, etc. to provide essential educational programs for our students.

There is a significant shortage of related services providers in New Mexico. These services are very expensive. Our rural location also has an impact – we pay per diem and travel when people are not district employees. Districts need funds to make salaries more competitive.

In order for us to provide the education necessary for all students to be successful, we must be able to have the resources for hiring the necessary staff, providing the staff with the tools they need to be successful in their classrooms and to implement the programs needed to ensure student success. All of these require a long term commitment that we will only be able to make with the assurance of sufficient funding in the years to come.

#### **MEMBERSHIP LESS THAN 1,000**

**Animas Public Schools:** The failure of the Legislature to adequately fund the REC's and the seeming lack of understanding on the part of the PED on the vital role the REC's play in leveraging services to make them available to rural districts such as ours needs to be addressed. If the REC's are adequately funded they can and do provide many benefits to the cooperating districts that would otherwise be prohibitively expensive or not available at all.

If the state would adopt a single Short Cycle Assessment and pay for it up front without running it through the bureaucratic fiscal process it would save many thousands of dollars in expense to the districts. There are people here in New Mexico that are perfectly capable of developing these assessments; in addition the last assessment given sometime past April 15th each year could serve as the NMSBA. This would result in faster turnaround times and even more savings to the state.

**Carrizozo Municipal Schools:** IF THIS SUFFICIENCY FUNDING BECOMES A REALITY IT WILL BE - TRUE SCHOOL REFORM

The Carrizozo Municipal School District is a small school community with only about 205 students in K-12th grades. The Carrizozo School District strongly supports the passage of HB 241. If this bill would pass Carrizozo Schools would generate \$874,453 of new revenue. These additional funds would give us sufficient funding for much needed program and student needs.

If HB 241 passes Carrizozo School District through Local Autonomy would address the following needs:

1. Increase the school year to 185 instructional days and 4 additional professional development days for staff. \$137,000
2. Instructional Coach \$50,000
3. Technology/ITV Teacher \$50,000
4. 6th-8th Grade Math/Reading Teacher for LTPR to meet AYP \$50,000
5. K-6 Counselor \$50,000
6. Fine Arts/Music \$30,000
7. Gifted/AP Teacher \$50,000
8. Spanish Teacher K-8 \$50,000
9. 11th-12th Job Skills Teacher \$50,000
10. Parent Liaison \$40,000
11. Intervention Specialist \$40,000
12. Nurse \$30,000
13. Maintenance Person \$25,000
14. Technology Upgrade \$75,000
15. Educational Software/Instructional Materials \$99,389

TOTAL \$826,389

**Chama Valley Independent Schools:** Since CVISD is in the Next Smaller Gain (+7.7% to 11.6%) it will be very difficult to continue supporting the current program much less thinking of implementing new programs if the new funding formula is not passed without applying for emergency supplemental funding.

**Cimarron Municipal Schools:** The implementation of the proposed funding formula would insure that the Cimarron Municipal Schools District will meet the needs of the whole child.

**Clayton Municipal Schools:** Funding for RECs has to be addressed....We can't operate without our REC!!!!!!!!!!

**Cloudcroft Municipal Schools:** People demand the best education that they can get for their children and are beginning to complain loudly about the reduction in quality that they are witnessing. The public perception of the underfunding of schools is becoming a huge issue that someone will have to answer.

**Corona Public Schools:** This issue has been one that we have all struggled with for many years. Increased mandates and continued increased of other fixed cost have expanded the problem. Students in small schools may benefit from small class sizes but they are at a grave disadvantage in program offerings. We can continue to hold that equitable distribution of funding is important but in doing so we lose the best interest of all of the children. Schools small in stature and rural in nature have children too and they deserve equity in education. If it cost more to provide a sufficient education then we should find the resources to make it happen.

**Cuba Independent Schools:** According to New Mexico's Constitution, it is the responsibility of the Governor and the Legislature to fund education at a sufficient level. The 2-year study on sufficiency has indicated that the Governor and the Legislature have not funded public education to a sufficient level. I totally expect the Legislature and the Governor to make sufficient funding of public education their number one priority for the 2009 legislative session.

**Des Moines Municipal Schools:** The amount of time and effort presently expended to accomplish the requirements of education with very limited financial resources is misplaced/ misspent effort. When funded appropriately the time and effort expended on making ends meet can be directed toward the correct focus of the educational community's existence, educating the children of New Mexico to be world citizens for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. New Mexico Schools with enrollments of less than 100 students will not benefit from this formula and will probably require supplemental funds.

**Elida Municipal Schools:** I believe that the disbursement of emergency supplemental funds are based more on politics than actual need of the district. I know of a district with similar size as ours which is granted \$300,000, when we receive a little over \$100,000.

**Eunice Public Schools:** The Funding Formula Task Force concluded that additional funding is needed in the formula to ensure schools receive sufficient funding to educate our children and meet our pressing financial needs.

In my opinion, there is an interconnection between funding of education and student performance. Districts are held accountable to teach students the necessary skills and provide them with the knowledge they need to be academically proficient. Educating children is a difficult enough process without being laden with obstacles such as insufficient funding for maintaining educational programs. The programs discussed throughout this document increase opportunities for students to develop and live successful lives. The programs, staff, and materials could materialize if we had sufficient funding – funding, that would in all probability, lead to increased student performance.

We believe children have dreams and they hold these dreams within their hearts. A decent education, sufficiently funded, is their only hope of achieving and realizing their dreams. We believe it is within the power of the Legislature and the Governor to provide children with an opportunity to believe in and realize their dreams by providing them with educational opportunities, void of insufficient funds, and strengthened with programs that expand their learning horizons. The expectation of our District and our children is clear, the Governor and the Legislature must make the sufficient funding formula a priority for the 2009 Legislative session. By passing the new funding formula, children will be afforded opportunities to successfully maximize their educational potential.

**Floyd Municipal Schools:** Concerns are over whether or not any “new funds” to address sufficiency will be “ear-marked” or will there be local control over program implementation!

**Hondo Valley Public Schools:** The PED cannot continue to operate on a “one size fits all” model of education. Small rural districts are totally different than medium and large districts. We need more flexibility in the mandates that are prescribed for all districts. Also,

categorical funding should be re-examined by the legislature. We end up returning transportation funding each year yet cannot afford to pay for propane to heat our classrooms. It doesn't make sense.

**House Municipal Schools:** Our district takes seriously the identified goals of our Educational Plan for Student Success. The continued practice of blending grade levels in classrooms due to budgetary constraints is affecting the potential to meet the needs of our students.

**Jal Public Schools:** The EPSS would probably be the best mechanism to tie together the budget approval and program delivery, but there should not be any additional requirements added by the legislation or PED.

The district would continue to be responsible to meet the standards now in place. It would be up to the district to decide how to best use any remaining funds.

**Jemez Mountain Public Schools:** The small/rural school districts in New Mexico are facing significant hardships under the existing funding formula. The state has wisely provided for Supplemental Emergency Funds; however, this is not a fix for insufficiency. Economics of Scale are real. Additionally, challenges facing districts like JMSD include remoteness, sparsity, isolation, the need for staff housing, lack of community infrastructure, the operation of multiple campuses, and transportation costs. The reality is that a simple cost per pupil calculation does not come close to factoring in the additional costs of operating in this environment. New Mexico must remember that rural communities and the schools that support them are vital to the State's survival and growth.

According to New Mexico's Constitution, it is the responsibility of state government to fund education at a sufficient level. The 2-year study on sufficiency has indicated that additional funding is necessary to meet sufficiency.

**Jemez Valley Public Schools:** The implementation of the proposed funding formula would allow the Jemez Valley Public Schools to operate with/under a comprehensive budget that is not pieced together from remnant revenue sources.

In order for us to provide the education necessary for all students to be successful, we must be able to have the resources for hiring the necessary staff, providing the staff with the tools they need to be successful in their classrooms and to implement the programs needed to ensure student success.

**Lake Arthur Municipal Schools:** The quality of education for New Mexico students is the lifeblood of economic development within New Mexico. To short change the educational programs and services needed by New Mexico children sends the state into a downward spiral from which it might never recover. The needs of educating the children of New Mexico will continue to grow while the available educational level of the adult population would continue to decrease. The educational performance of the adult population would then be unable to provide a sustainable and viable economic base for establishing a recurring revenue stream that continually promotes the economic vitality of the state. All programs and services supported by the government would decrease, not just educational programs and services.



**Logan Municipal Schools:** I want the taxpayers and the legislature to know that I appreciate everything that you have done to support education in New Mexico, and in the Logan School District in particular.

I also want you to know that I feel that I would not be doing my job as Superintendent if I did not do everything that I could to ensure that all of my students receive their constitutionally mandated "sufficient education." It is my sincere belief that to provide this sufficient education, we need to fund schools at the level and with the distribution described by the Funding Formula Task Force Study.

I know that you will do everything that you can to support this funding, and rest assured, that I will do everything I can to ensure this funding and distribution is implemented.

**Lordsburg Municipal Schools:** The implementation of the proposed funding formula would allow the Lordsburg district to truly develop long-term strategic plans. Currently, we plan only on short-term bases, given the uncertainty of funding.

The factor of isolation will cause the provision of adequate educational opportunities in small communities such as Lordsburg, to be increasingly costly. The current formula, while attempting to provide equity, has developed too many "loopholes" and been overly avoided in the allocation of funds to New Mexico's schools. Adoption of, and funding of, the proposed formula will reinstate equity in New Mexico's educational program if it is honored by the avoidance of separate categorical funding for "pet projects" into the future. The resulting funding will also bring our revenues in line with very real costs of "doing business."

**Maxwell Municipal Schools:** It is crystal clear to us that the arbitrary 16% special education factor rewards districts below 16% actual sped students and punishes those above.

It is also clear to us that abolition of emergency funding would be a major blow to small districts with declining enrollment.

We assume that the LESC has been disadvantaged, as we have been, by the use of 2006-7 enrollment data to estimate 2009-2010 fiscal impact. New and current data student enrollment estimates should be used.

Finally, we encourage the LESC to review the highly divergent impact percentage-wise that this formula is projected to have on school districts.

**Melrose Public Schools:** I must comment as superintendent of Melrose Municipal Schools, I have been quite blessed with very intelligent and dedicated school boards. My teachers/staff are committed to excellence in their occupations concerning the preparation of our children and are second to none. The Village of Melrose is steadfast in support of education. We understand that making funding decisions is not easy for legislators and we do appreciate our legislators.

Points of interest in reference to Melrose Municipal Schools:

- Melrose Municipal Schools resides in the Village of Melrose with population approximately 800.
- The Village of Melrose is located approximately 25 miles West of Clovis, New Mexico and Cannon Air Force Base.
- Melrose Municipal Schools has approximately 230 students K12.
- The school consists of elementary (grades Preschool-6<sup>th</sup>), junior high (7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>), and high school (9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>).
- Melrose Municipal Schools has, always, achieved AYP (Annual Yearly Progress) and has never requested emergency supplemental.
- Melrose Municipal Schools District is approximately 718 square miles and provides 6 bus routes for student transportation.
- At present, 75% of Melrose Municipal Schools' graduates either have a degree or are attending college. The percentages will vary each year as graduating class numbers fluctuate. These percentages have been compiled over a 10 year period.

**Mountainair Public Schools:** The district may be forced to use a larger percentage of operational dollars for capital outlay type projects in the future, especially in the area of maintenance of buildings and grounds. We have a roofing project in conjunction with PSFA that has been approved for 3 years. This project has not yet begun. We sustain more damage to the building whenever the roof leaks. We are simply waiting on PSFA to move this project forward.

**Peñasco Independent Schools:** The expense of operating a rural district continues to reflect the national trend of inflation. Fuel expenses have increased particularly in the rural areas resulting in an increase in all services provided in school districts. Rural schools are often isolated from general services available to urban school districts resulting in extensive expenses assumed for services by rural districts.

The implementation of the new funding formula would allow long-term planning for our district. Currently plans on a year to year basis depending on the budget.

Presently, the District's REC has been very instrumental in assisting the District with professional development for principals, teachers and non-instructional staff. The REC has provided the District with excellent trainers, more specifically, "practitioners". I ask that the funding for the District's REC continue and increase if possible so that a continuation of this very valuable service may be provided.

In order for the district to meet the needs of our students we must be able to have the resources for hiring the necessary staff, providing the staff with the tools they need to be successful in the classroom and to be able to implement the program needed to insure student success. A long-term commitment is needed that will assure the district with sufficient funding in the years to come.

**Quemado Independent Schools:** Just getting off the "emergency funding" list is important to us. We hate to be viewed as irresponsible when we are using funds to cover basic program costs, not new or extra programs.

**Questa Independent Schools:** The expense of operating a rural district continues to reflect the national trend of inflation. Fuel expenses have increased resulting in an increase in all services provided in school districts. Rural schools are often isolated from general services available to urban school districts resulting in extensive expenses assumed for services by rural districts.

Presently, the District's REC has been very instrumental in assisting the District with professional development for principals, teachers and non-instructional staff. The REC has provided the District with excellent trainers, more specifically, "practitioners". I ask that the funding for the District's REC continue and increase if possible so that a continuation of this very valuable service may be provided.

**Reserve Independent Schools:** We believe that isolation factors are more significant than realized in the study. Cost related issues of travel, teacher recruitment/retention, professional development opportunities, etc. play an increasingly significant role in the day to day operation of our districts.

**Roy Municipal Schools:** Schools that are below 85 kids need to be funded at that level. This would provide about 1.6 million which would provide enough funding so that we could provide additional programs that we have already lost. An enrollment baseline needs to be identified to determine when a school has become too small.

**Santa Rosa Consolidated Schools:** The biggest disparity that I see that has not been addressed is the large disparity among schools in the area of SB 9. There is a huge disparity in funding for schools in this area. The state match does somewhat help in this area, however, some districts get vastly disproportionate amount of money compared to other district. In this respect where you live does impact the amount of money received under SB 9. I would advocate for an equalization formula for the SB 9 funds.

**Springer Municipal Schools:** New Mexico Schools with enrollments of less than 150 students will not benefit from this formula and will probably require supplemental funds.

**Tatum Municipal Schools:** As superintendent of Tatum Schools, I understand our legislatures have a very difficult job. Everyone wants a larger piece of the pie and the pie is only so big. I do believe that small schools are being hit the hardest in terms of our current funding formula not adequately educating our children. Thank you for your consideration.

**Texico Municipal Schools:** I must comment as superintendent of Texico Municipal Schools, I have been quite blessed with very intelligent and dedicated school boards. My teachers/staff are committed to excellence in their occupations concerning the preparation of our children and are second to none. The town of Texico is steadfast in support of education. We understand that making funding decisions is not easy for legislators and we do appreciate our legislators.

**Vaughn Municipal Schools:** The underfunding of schools is becoming a big issue in the state. The public is complaining about the reduction in quality education and demanding the best education for their children. Vaughn Municipal Schools is currently, and will continue to run our district with available resources.

**Wagon Mound Public Schools:** The issue of mandates to schools without sufficient funding has not been addressed. This places a hardship on schools that are on supplemental emergency funding.

**PROPOSED PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO  
2007-2008 FINAL FUNDED PROGRAM COST PLUS ACTUAL EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS  
(CHARTER SCHOOLS ONLY)**

CHARTER SCHOOL	2007-2008 FUNDED MEM	GRADES	CURRENT FORMULA			PROPOSED FORMULA			INCREASE/DECREASE	
			2007-2008 FINAL FUNDED PROGRAM COST	2007-2008 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL OPERATIONAL FUNDING	OVERALL ADJUSTMENT	ISQ	2007-2008 CALCULATOR PROGRAM COST	AMOUNT	PERCENT
1 ALBUQUERQUE										
2 ACADEMIA DE LENGUA Y CULTURA	99.50	6-8	\$844,282		\$844,282	1.543	1.000	\$1,119,023	\$274,741	32.5%
3 AIMS/UNM (High Tech High)	149.50	6, 9-11	\$1,485,731		\$1,485,731	1.772	1.000	\$1,168,644	(\$317,087)	-21.3%
4 ALB TALENT DEV SECONDARY (2007-2008)*	90.00	9-12	\$918,429		\$918,429					
5 AMY BIEHL	221.00	9-12	\$2,391,010		\$2,391,010	1.391	1.000	\$2,122,698	(\$268,312)	-11.2%
6 BATAAN MILITARY ACADEMY (2007-2008)*	114.00	9-11	\$1,086,435		\$1,086,435					
7 CAREER ACADEMIC TECH ACADEMY (2007-2008)*	99.00	10-12	\$1,004,443		\$1,004,443					
8 CESAR CHAVEZ COMM. SCHOOL	141.50	9-12	\$1,626,639		\$1,626,639	1.657	1.000	\$1,619,444	(\$7,195)	-0.4%
9 CHRISTINE DUNCAN COMMUNITY	154.50	K-5	\$1,388,422		\$1,388,422	1.194	1.000	\$969,228	(\$419,194)	-30.2%
10 CORRALES INTERNATIONAL (2008-2009)	N/A	K-8								
11 CREATIVE ED. PREP INSTITUTE #1	174.50	9-12	\$1,581,126		\$1,581,126	1.483	1.000	\$1,782,716	\$201,590	12.7%
12 CREATIVE ED. PREP INSTITUTE #2	167.50	9-12	\$1,699,816		\$1,699,816	1.795	1.000	\$2,082,754	\$382,938	22.5%
13 DIGITAL ARTS & TECH ACADEMY	379.50	9-12	\$2,616,525		\$2,616,525	1.282	1.000	\$3,360,920	\$744,395	28.4%
14 EAST MOUNTAIN	308.50	9-12	\$2,445,867		\$2,445,867	1.223	1.000	\$2,606,569	\$160,702	6.6%
15 EL CAMINO REAL (Horizon Academy South)	644.50	K-12	\$4,212,146		\$4,212,146	1.181	1.000	\$5,190,442	\$978,296	23.2%
16 GORDON BERNALL (2008-2009)	N/A	9-12								
17 LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA	216.50	6-12	\$2,738,352		\$2,738,352	2.466	1.000	\$3,679,437	\$941,084	34.4%
18 LA LUZ DEL MONTE	103.00	7-8	\$838,496		\$838,496	1.072	1.000	\$762,970	(\$75,525)	-9.0%
19 LA PROMESA EARLY LEADERSHIP	48.50	K-3	\$924,014		\$924,014	1.403	1.000	\$469,821	(\$454,193)	-49.2%
20 LA RESOLANA LEADERSHIP	53.00	6-8	\$518,699		\$518,699	1.633	1.000	\$637,084	\$118,386	22.8%
21 LOS PUENTES	118.00	8-12	\$1,470,248		\$1,470,248	2.778	1.000	\$2,264,080	\$793,832	54.0%
22 MONTESSORI ELEMENTARY	174.50	K-6	\$1,193,800		\$1,193,800	0.857	1.000	\$1,009,243	(\$184,557)	-15.5%
23 MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE	157.00	K-5	\$1,172,449		\$1,172,449	0.904	1.000	\$961,425	(\$211,024)	-18.0%
24 MOUNTAIN MAHOGANY	80.00	K-3	\$852,094		\$852,094	1.244	1.000	\$524,115	(\$327,979)	-38.5%
25 NATIVE AMERICAN COMM ACAD.	136.00	6-8	\$1,639,400		\$1,639,400	1.261	1.000	\$766,544	(\$872,856)	-53.2%
26 NORTH ALBUQUERQUE CO-OP COMM.	146.00	K-6	\$1,327,466		\$1,327,466	0.965	1.000	\$920,097	(\$407,369)	-30.7%
27 NUESTROS VALORES	125.50	9-12	\$1,450,785		\$1,450,785	2.298	1.000	\$1,793,257	\$342,472	23.6%
28 PAPA	312.50	6-12	\$2,403,187		\$2,403,187	1.221	1.000	\$2,644,350	\$241,163	10.0%
29 RALPH J. BUNCHE ACADEMY	79.50	K-5	\$734,790		\$734,790	1.309	1.000	\$782,033	\$47,243	6.4%
30 ROBERT F. KENNEDY	245.50	9-12	\$2,580,286		\$2,580,286	2.237	1.000	\$3,777,551	\$1,197,266	46.4%
31 SIA TECH	300.25	9-12	\$2,204,402		\$2,204,402	1.293	1.000	\$2,678,892	\$474,490	21.5%
32 SOUTH VALLEY	208.00	9-12	\$2,227,362		\$2,227,362	1.630	1.000	\$2,342,279	\$114,917	5.2%
33 SOUTHWEST PRIMARY	104.00	4-6	\$753,201		\$753,201	1.055	1.000	\$757,674	\$4,473	0.6%
34 SOUTHWEST SECONDARY	252.50	7-12	\$2,163,397		\$2,163,397	1.210	1.000	\$2,101,867	(\$61,530)	-2.8%
35 THE LRNG COMM CTR	175.50	6-12	\$1,783,567		\$1,783,567	1.479	1.000	\$1,798,339	\$14,773	0.8%
36 TWENTY FIRST CENT.	208.50	6-8	\$1,599,799		\$1,599,799	1.227	1.000	\$1,766,272	\$166,474	10.4%
37 YOUTH BUILD COMMUNITY	134.00	9-12	\$2,218,239		\$2,218,239	2.554	1.000	\$2,364,071	\$145,832	6.6%
38 AZTEC										
39 MOSAIC ACADEMY CHARTER	147.50	K-7	\$1,341,314		\$1,341,314	0.991	1.000	\$810,713	(\$530,602)	-39.6%
40 BERNALILLO										
41 VILLAGE ACADEMY	41.00	6-8	\$735,370		\$735,370	1.602	1.020	\$468,390	(\$266,980)	-36.3%
42 CARLSBAD										
43 JEFFERSON MONT. ACAD.	90.00	K-12	\$1,079,799		\$1,079,799	1.767	1.044	\$1,146,775	\$66,976	6.2%
44 CIMARRON										
45 MORENO VALLEY HIGH	77.00	9-12	\$862,724		\$862,724	1.616	1.023	\$879,092	\$16,369	1.9%
46 DEMING										
47 DEMING CESAR CHAVEZ	108.00	9-12	\$1,196,655		\$1,196,655	1.344	1.000	\$984,263	(\$212,392)	-17.7%
48 ESPAÑOLA										
49 CARIÑOS DE LOS NIÑOS	76.50	K-2	\$819,937		\$819,937	1.342	1.000	\$551,501	(\$268,436)	-32.7%
50 ESPAÑOLA MILITARY ACADEMY	255.00	6-11	\$2,104,330		\$2,104,330	1.408	1.000	\$2,304,787	\$200,458	9.5%
51 GALLUP										
52 MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH	47.50	10-12	\$569,308		\$569,308	1.558	1.000	\$511,190	(\$58,118)	-10.2%

**PROPOSED PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA PROGRAM COST COMPARED TO  
2007-2008 FINAL FUNDED PROGRAM COST PLUS ACTUAL EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS  
(CHARTER SCHOOLS ONLY)**

	CHARTER SCHOOL	2007-2008 FUNDED MEM	GRADES	CURRENT FORMULA			PROPOSED FORMULA			INCREASE/DECREASE	
				2007-2008 FINAL FUNDED PROGRAM COST	2007-2008 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS	TOTAL OPERATIONAL FUNDING	OVERALL ADJUSTMENT	ISQ	2007-2008 CALCULATOR PROGRAM COST	AMOUNT	PERCENT
53	JEMEZ MOUNTAIN										
54	LINDRITH AREA HERITAGE	26.00	K-8	\$276,528		\$276,528	1.660	1.000	\$229,270	(\$47,259)	-17.1%
55	JEMEZ VALLEY										
56	SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER	112.00	K-8	\$969,821	\$195,000	\$1,164,821	1.510	1.000	\$1,168,366	\$3,545	0.3%
57	WALATOWA HIGH CHARTER	57.50	9-12	\$636,544		\$636,544	2.092	1.000	\$830,656	\$194,113	30.5%
58	LAS CRUCES										
59	ALMA D'ARTE CHARTER	164.00	9-12	\$1,624,063		\$1,624,063	1.908	1.000	\$2,161,373	\$537,310	33.1%
60	LA ACADEMIA DOLORES HUERTA	115.50	6-8	\$894,598		\$894,598	1.444	1.000	\$1,151,625	\$257,027	28.7%
61	LAS MONTAÑAS (2007-2008)*	101.00	9-10	\$1,001,567		\$1,001,567					
62	QUESTA										
63	RED RIVER VALLEY	85.00	K-8	\$732,247		\$732,247	1.267	1.007	\$748,993	\$16,746	2.3%
64	ROOTS & WINGS	24.00	5-8	\$233,286		\$233,286	1.644	1.005	\$273,809	\$40,522	17.4%
65	ROSWELL										
66	SIDNEY GUTIERREZ	58.50	6-8	\$513,140		\$513,140	1.350	1.000	\$545,272	\$32,132	6.3%
67	SANTA FE										
68	ACADEMY FOR TECH & CLASSICS	246.50	7-12	\$2,574,260		\$2,574,260	1.341	1.000	\$2,282,580	(\$291,680)	-11.3%
69	CHARTER SCHOOL #37	138.50	9-11	\$1,350,158		\$1,350,158	1.663	1.000	\$1,212,006	(\$138,152)	-10.2%
70	MONTE DEL SOL	362.50	7-12	\$2,845,832		\$2,845,832	1.316	1.000	\$3,294,419	\$448,587	15.8%
71	TURQUOISE TRAIL	449.00	K-6	\$2,878,228		\$2,878,228	1.116	1.000	\$3,462,220	\$583,992	20.3%
72	SILVER CITY CONS.										
73	ALDO LEOPOLD	87.50	9-12	\$1,173,878		\$1,173,878	1.758	1.040	\$909,616	(\$264,263)	-22.5%
74	SOCORRO										
75	COTTONWOOD CHARTER	164.00	K-8	\$1,176,663		\$1,176,663	1.265	1.000	\$1,433,203	\$256,539	21.8%
76	TAOS										
77	ANANSI CHARTER	48.50	K-3	\$487,519		\$487,519	1.471	1.000	\$492,773	\$5,253	1.1%
78	TAOS CHARTER	202.50	K-8	\$1,355,978		\$1,355,978	1.247	1.000	\$1,743,566	\$387,588	28.6%
79	VISTA GRANDE (2007-2008)*	77.00	9-10	\$828,902		\$828,902					
80	WEST LAS VEGAS										
81	RIO GALLINAS CHARTER SCHOOL	78.50	2-8	\$959,096		\$959,096	1.837	1.000	\$704,211	(\$254,885)	-26.6%
82											
83	STATE CHARTERS										
84	COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL (Albuquerque/2008-2009)*	N/A	6-9								
85	HORIZON ACADEMY WEST (Albuquerque)	440.00	K-6	\$2,583,560		\$2,583,560	0.877	1.000	\$2,660,356	\$76,797	3.0%
86	MEDIA ARTS COLLABORATIVE (Albuquerque/2008-2009)*	N/A	9-12								
87	NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY (Albuquerque)	420.00	K-8	\$2,424,971		\$2,424,971	1.010	1.000	\$2,824,225	\$399,254	16.5%
88	STATEWIDE	10,422.25		\$92,325,178	\$195,000	\$92,520,178			\$92,609,092	\$88,914	0.1%

\*These charter schools were not included in the original analysis done by the American Institutes of Research (AIR).

STUDENTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT  
STUDENTS IN PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT  
BASED ON THE 2007-2008 120-DAY STARS REPORT (*charter schools only*)

District	120-Day Total Enrollment	Special Education Service Level*				Total Special Education Excluding Gifted	Percent Special Education	Gifted Service Level*				Total Gifted	Percent Gifted
		A	B	C	D			A	B	C	D		
1 ALBUQUERQUE													
2 ACADEMIA DE LENGUA Y CULTURA	69	0	5	1	0	6	8.7%	5	0	0	0	5	7.2%
3 AIMS/UNM (High Tech High)	112	8	0	0	0	8	7.1%	15	0	0	0	15	13.4%
4 ALB TALENT DEV SECONDARY (2007-2008)*	159	1	2	1	6	10	6.3%	1	1	0	0	2	1.3%
5 AMY BIEHL	251	4	12	10	3	29	11.6%	17	3	0	0	20	8.0%
6 BATAAN MILITARY ACADEMY (2007-2008)*	103	1	0	0	0	1	1.0%	1	0	0	0	1	1.0%
7 CAREER ACADEMIC TECH ACADEMY (2007-2008)*	124	4	7	5	0	16	12.9%	4	0	0	0	4	3.2%
8 CESAR CHAVEZ COMM. SCHOOL	150	2	6	6	3	17	11.3%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
9 CHRISTINE DUNCAN COMMUNITY	158	4	1	4	2	11	7.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
10 CORRALES INTERNATIONAL (2008-2009)	N/A												
11 CREATIVE ED. PREP INSTITUTE #1	171	0	10	3	0	13	7.6%	1	1	0	0	2	1.2%
12 CREATIVE ED. PREP INSTITUTE #2	160	1	11	12	8	32	20.0%	0	4	0	0	4	2.5%
13 DIGITAL ARTS & TECH ACADEMY	315	11	2	8	3	24	7.6%	5	2	0	0	7	2.2%
14 EAST MOUNTAIN	321	3	15	7	0	25	7.8%	33	14	0	0	47	14.6%
15 EL CAMINO REAL (Horizon Academy South)	579	19	44	13	13	89	15.4%	1	5	0	0	6	1.0%
16 GORDON BERNALL (2008-2009)	N/A												
17 LA ACADEMIA DE ESPERANZA	210	4	10	25	60	99	47.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
18 LA LUZ DEL MONTE	106	0	1	0	0	1	0.9%	12	0	0	0	12	11.3%
19 LA PROMESA EARLY LEADERSHIP	65	1	1	0	0	2	3.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
20 LA RESOLANA LEADERSHIP	51	0	3	2	5	10	19.6%	1	0	0	0	1	2.0%
21 LOS PUENTES	128	2	11	19	9	41	32.0%	0	2	0	0	2	1.6%
22 MONTESSORI ELEMENTARY	193	6	3	1	0	10	5.2%	3	5	0	0	8	4.1%
23 MONTESSORI OF THE RIO GRANDE	156	4	10	3	0	17	10.9%	0	1	0	0	1	0.6%
24 MOUNTAIN MAHOGANY	76	6	0	1	5	12	15.8%	1	0	0	0	1	1.3%
25 NATIVE AMERICAN COMM ACAD.	147	4	10	1	1	16	10.9%	4	2	0	0	6	4.1%
26 NORTH ALBUQUERQUE CO-OP COMM.	154	15	11	1	3	30	19.5%	1	0	0	0	1	0.6%
27 NUESTROS VALORES	125	0	9	4	2	15	12.0%	1	0	0	0	1	0.8%
28 PAPA	351	4	16	5	0	25	7.1%	8	11	0	0	19	5.4%
29 RALPH J. BUNCHE ACADEMY	62	2	2	2	2	8	12.9%	0	1	0	0	1	1.6%
30 ROBERT F. KENNEDY	255	8	18	28	10	64	25.1%	0	3	0	0	3	1.2%
31 SIA TECH	302	1	2	12	12	27	8.9%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
32 SOUTH VALLEY	212	3	17	0	0	20	9.4%	12	0	0	0	12	5.7%
33 SOUTHWEST PRIMARY	104	2	2	0	0	4	3.8%	8	0	0	0	8	7.7%
34 SOUTHWEST SECONDARY	260	0	2	0	4	6	2.3%	31	0	0	0	31	11.9%
35 THE LRNG COMM CTR	181	3	9	7	2	21	11.6%	1	2	0	0	3	1.7%
36 TWENTY FIRST CENT.	208	1	11	7	2	21	10.1%	0	15	0	1	16	7.7%
37 YOUTH BUILD COMMUNITY	197	4	18	15	3	40	20.3%	0	0	1	0	1	0.5%
38 AZTEC													
39 MOSAIC ACADEMY CHARTER	159	5	14	12	0	31	19.5%	6	1	0	0	7	4.4%
40 BERNALILLO													
41 VILLAGE ACADEMY	62	0	2	6	2	10	16.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
42 CARLSBAD													
43 JEFFERSON MONT. ACAD.	88	4	6	2	0	12	13.6%	9	0	0	0	9	10.2%
44 CIMARRON													
45 MORENO VALLEY HIGH	82	2	5	0	0	7	8.5%	3	0	0	0	3	3.7%
46 DEMING													
47 DEMING CESAR CHAVEZ	118	0	2	3	0	5	4.2%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
48 ESPAÑOLA													
49 CARINOS DE LOS NIÑOS	80	2	2	0	3	7	8.8%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
50 ESPAÑOLA MILITARY ACADEMY	139	1	0	2	9	12	8.6%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
51 GALLUP													
52 MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH	53	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	1	0	0	1	1.9%

ATTACHMENT 7

STUDENTS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT  
STUDENTS IN PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT  
BASED ON THE 2007-2008 120-DAY STARS REPORT (*charter schools only*)

	District	120-Day Total Enrollment	Special Education Service Level*				Total Special Education Excluding Gifted	Percent Special Education	Gifted Service Level*				Total Gifted	Percent Gifted
			A	B	C	D			A	B	C	D		
53	JEMEZ MOUNTAIN													
54	LINDRITH AREA HERITAGE	26	4	2	0	0	6	23.1%	1	0	0	0	1	3.8%
55	JEMEZ VALLEY													
56	SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE CHARTER	105	9	5	0	1	15	14.3%	1	0	0	0	1	1.0%
57	WALATOWA HIGH CHARTER	55	0	8	0	0	8	14.5%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
58	LAS CRUCES													
59	ALMA D'ARTE CHARTER	165	12	10	2	0	24	14.5%	15	0	0	0	15	9.1%
60	LA ACADEMIA DOLORES HUERTA	112	0	2	2	0	4	3.6%	3	0	0	0	3	2.7%
61	LAS MONTAÑAS (2007-2008)*	94	1	4	11	0	16	17.0%	2	0	0	0	2	2.1%
62	QUESTA													
63	RED RIVER VALLEY	57	8	8	0	0	16	28.1%	1	0	0	0	1	1.8%
64	ROOTS & WINGS	26	0	1	1	0	2	7.7%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
65	ROSWELL													
66	SIDNEY GUTIERREZ	60	2	3	0	0	5	8.3%	1	15	0	0	16	26.7%
67	SANTA FE													
68	ACADEMY FOR TECH & CLASSICS	280	10	37	7	2	56	20.0%	33	13	0	0	46	16.4%
69	CHARTER SCHOOL #37	92	1	11	1	0	13	14.1%	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
70	MONTE DEL SOL	364	2	33	21	5	61	16.8%	17	54	0	0	71	19.5%
71	TURQUOISE TRAIL	443	37	31	10	2	80	18.1%	14	11	0	0	25	5.6%
72	SILVER CITY CONS.													
73	ALDO LEOPOLD	76	1	6	1	0	8	10.5%	4	0	0	0	4	5.3%
74	SOCORRO													
75	COTTONWOOD CHARTER	170	13	9	0	2	24	14.1%	5	17	0	0	22	12.9%
76	TAOS													
77	ANANSI CHARTER	50	8	2	2	0	12	24.0%	0	1	0	0	1	2.0%
78	TAOS CHARTER	203	15	9	0	0	24	11.8%	20	0	0	0	20	9.9%
79	VISTA GRANDE (2007-2008)*	70	8	0	2	0	10	14.3%	1	0	0	0	1	1.4%
80	WEST LAS VEGAS													
81	RIO GALLINAS CHARTER SCHOOL	87	2	12	2	0	16	18.4%	2	2	0	0	4	4.6%
82														
83	STATE CHARTERS													
84	COTTONWOOD CLASSICAL (Albuquerque/2008-2009)*	N/A												
85	HORIZON ACADEMY WEST (Albuquerque)	434	12	22	0	0	34	7.8%	0	29	0	0	29	6.7%
86	MEDIA ARTS COLLABORATIVE (Albuquerque/2008-2009)*	N/A												
87	NORTH VALLEY ACADEMY (Albuquerque)	365	5	26	0	1	32	8.8%	2	4	0	0	6	1.6%
88	STATEWIDE	10,330	292	553	290	185	1,320	12.8%	306	220	1	1	528	5.1%

\* Service Levels:

Level A = Less than 10% of the day

Level B = 11% to 49% of the day

Level C = 50% of the day or more but not a full day

Level D = Up to a full day or program 3Y/4Y/5Y (DD)